NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
3 0109 00007 5625

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN THE LAST QUARTER-CENTURY

148195

BR 479 S66 Smith
Religious thought in the last quarter-century.

DATE DUE

APR 26 1976			
MAY 5 1986			

Subject To Recall After 2 Weeks

LIBRARY
NORTH DAKOTA
STATE UNIVERSITY
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

DEMCO

WITHDRAWN

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN THE LAST QUARTER-CENTURY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

—

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT
in the
LAST QUARTER-CENTURY

By

J. M. POWIS SMITH, SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE
HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY, JOHN THOMAS
McNEILL, GERALD BIRNEY SMITH, EDWARD
L. SCHAUB, A. EUSTACE HAYDON, THEODORE
GERALD SOARES, OZORA S. DAVIS, ARCHI-
BALD G. BAKER, AND SHAILER MATHEWS

Edited by GERALD BIRNEY SMITH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

148195

N. D. S. U. LIBRARY
FARGO, N. D.

28-7958

Copyright 1927 By
The University of Chicago

All Rights Reserved

Published November 1927

BR
479
S66

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

N. D. S. U. LIBRARY
FARGO, N. D.

PREFATORY NOTE

During the year 1926 the *Journal of Religion* published a series of articles covering some of the important realms of religion. In these articles the attempt was made to survey the progress of scholarship during the quarter-century just ended, and to indicate some of the important questions which are now engaging the attention of scholars. These studies are collected in the present volume. One or two important realms are, unfortunately, not treated, owing largely to the limitations of space in the *Journal*. It was thought best to publish the articles in the form in which they originally appeared rather than to delay for such revisions as might take account of literature which has appeared during the past few months. Since it was impossible to present an exhaustive list of the publications during the quarter-century, the authors were asked to cite only what they regarded as the really significant contributions, and to devote their main attention to important achievements in the study of religion in America during the period named.

It is hoped that this volume may be of value to students in enabling them to appreciate nearly a generation of fruitful theological scholarship, and that it will help toward the understanding of the important questions and tasks which lie before the next generation of scholars.

GERALD BIRNEY SMITH, *Editor*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
Old Testament Interpretation	*J. M. Powis Smith*	1
The Life of Jesus	*Shirley Jackson Case*	26
The Study of Early Christianity	*Harold R. Willoughby*	42
The Interpretation of Protestantism	*John Thomas McNeill*	70
Theological Thinking in America	*Gerald Birney Smith*	95
The Psychology of Religion in America	*Edward L. Schaub*	116
History of Religions	*A. Eustace Haydon*	140
Religious Education	*Theodore Gerald Soares*	167
American Preaching	*Ozora S. Davis*	185
Thought concerning Protestant Foreign Missions	*Archibald G. Baker*	207
The Development of Social Christianity in America	*Shailer Mathews*	228

OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION

J. M. POWIS SMITH

Modern times have seen a revolution taking place in the field of biblical interpretation. Past generations had looked upon the Bible as the literal "Word of God." This conception almost eliminated from consideration man's part in the production of the Scriptures. More recent times, however, have insisted upon magnifying the part of man in this connection. The Bible is none the less the record of the working out of the increasing purpose of God, but very much more than heretofore it is now recognized as the work of man. The realization of this fact has greatly intensified the interest of scholars in the work of its interpretation, the more or less conscious feeling being that if man produced the Bible, man can understand it. The first quarter of the present century has seen a great deal of activity in the field of Old Testament interpretation. In so far as this has been exercised in connection with the work of excavation and discovery we may refer to an article in the *Journal of Religion* on that especial subject.[1]

New departures have been made in the work of textual criticism in recent years. It has long been held that the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible was fixed at a relatively early date and handed down faithfully from that time till now. But the work of Dr. Paul Kahle has brought out clearly the fact that there was no such uniformity of text as has been supposed

[1] See VI (1926), 284–301.

until a very much later period.[2] These studies open up new approaches to textual studies that should yield valuable results. Similar studies have been under way upon the Septuagint. The Göttingen group of scholars has put out a large number of booklets upon various Greek manuscripts, all preparatory to the preparation of a new, scientifically controlled Greek text of the Old Testament.[3] The Cambridge Septuagint began to appear in 1906, but so far has progressed only through the Octateuch. It prints the text of Codex Vaticanus, as Swete also did, and supplements it by a good critical apparatus giving the readings of the most important manuscripts.[4] Such textual studies are proof of severe and exacting scholarship and make hard reading; but they lie at the basis of all further critical work. The text is the foundation and starting-point of all interpretation and historical reconstruction. Little has been done thus far upon the Peshitto text. But Dr. William C. Graham announces his intention to approach that problem through the quotations of Bar Hebraeus, the Syriac commentator.[5]

In the field of literary criticism the Pentateuch has received most attention during the last twenty-five years. At the beginning of this century, the analysis of the Hexateuch,

[2] See Paul Kahle, *Der Masoretische Text des Alten Testament nach der Ueberlieferung der Babylonischen Juden* (1902); idem, *Die Masoreten des Ostens* (1913).

[3] See, e.g., Rahlfs, *Ester Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen* (1908); Rahlfs *et al., Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens u.s.w.* (1910 ff.); Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* I–III; Cf. O. Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta* (1910); Eberhard Nestle, in *American Journal of Theology,* Vol. XIV (April, 1910).

[4] A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek,* Part I (Genesis, 1906), II (Exodus and Leviticus, 1909), III (Numbers and Deuteronomy, 1911), IV (Joshua, 1917).

[5] See *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* Vols. XLI and XLII (1925–26).

as laboriously worked out by such scholars as Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Bacon, and their successors, was an accepted fact. The results thus far achieved were gathered up in the Oxford Hexateuch.[6] This has been the standard work upon the subject ever since its appearance. The matter has not been allowed to rest there undisturbed, however. Conservative scholarship in the persons of the London barrister, H. M. Wiener,[7] and the German pastor, Johannes Dahse,[8] to say nothing of half a dozen other scholars, has spared no pains in its efforts to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch against the critical attack. The efforts of such scholars were all to no purpose. Their main attempt was to discredit the Massoretic text and to substitute for it the text of the LXX. This was fundamentally an unsound procedure. The LXX text is older than our existing Hebrew manuscripts, it is true; but there are two offsetting facts in favor of the Hebrew text. Our present oldest manuscripts are heirs of a far older textual tradition, which in general, at least, they have faithfully preserved. That tradition may well have been quite as old as the time of the Greek translation. Not only so, but the Hebrew text is of Palestinian origin, while the Greek text is of Alexandrine origin. The native text was, of course, more faithful to the original tradition, while the Egyptian text suffered many things at the hands of its Greek copyists and interpreters. Dahse and Wiener made much of the variations in the

[6] J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersley, *The Hexateuch according to the Revised Version, Arranged in Its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1900), 2 vols.

[7] *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* (1900); *The Origin of the Pentateuch* (1910); *Pentateuchal Studies* (1912); and many articles.

[8] *Text-kritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage* (1912).

writing of the divine names furnished by the LXX.[9] Their claims failed to carry conviction; first, because their textual criticism was not sound; and secondly, because the analysis of the Hexateuch rests upon a much broader basis than the use of the divine names. The differences in language, in thought, in purpose, and in the records of the history are so great and numerous that they in and of themselves demonstrate the existence of various sources. The names simply add one more fact and furnish designations for the sources. Defenders like Wiener, Dahse, Eerdmans, and others furnish cold comfort to traditionalists, for they do but substitute textual criticism for literary criticism and they are forced to have recourse to other analytical methods which leave the supporter of the conservative position in a situation that is almost as far from his own natural status as is the position held by modern scholarship.

The analysis of the Hexateuch has gone on, however, notwithstanding the attacks upon it. The new work has been done chiefly by German scholars. Rudolph Smend, in 1912, published a new study of the sources of the Hexateuch.[10] He concerned himself primarily with the narrative portions of the text, leaving the legal sections in general untouched. He built upon Wellhausen's conclusions, but "corrected" and supplemented them at some points. His new propositions were as follows: Instead of J^3, he introduced RJ. That is, there were four successive editors of the Hexateuch, instead of three; and RJ lay before the creator of E. RJ's work was to combine and harmonize J^1 and J^2. In regard to the constitution of E, which Wellhausen and his successors had analyzed into E^1, E^2,

[9] For a satisfactory reply to this argument, see J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (1914).

[10] R. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (1912).

E^3, Smend held that E was essentially a unit. It arose in Judah about the beginning of the seventh century B.C. J^1 belonged in the latter half of the ninth century; J^2, in the beginning of the eighth; RJ brought these together, and upon the basis of his work, E was written. Then a second editor joined E with RJ, some time before Deuteronomy was written. The original Deuteronomy was introduced by chapters 1–4; after the exile a second edition of Deuteronomy was prepared and introduced by chapters 5–11. Then later on the two editions coalesced and were united with JE by a Deuteronomic editor. The main feature of this view was that it brought the origin of the E document down to the date of the latest elements in that document, instead of positing an early germ which later grew into its present form.

The latest treatment of the source-problem of the Hexateuch is by Otto Eissfeldt.[11] Previous systems of analysis had for the most part dealt with three sources, viz., J, E, and P, Deuteronomy not being included for the present. Eissfeldt, however, sets up four sources, viz., L, J, E, and P. His L stands for "Lay," and represents a source lacking any specifically religious purpose, dominated neither by prophetic nor by priestly influences. This L is made up largely of materials taken from the more familiar J^1 and J^2. The same analysis was carried over by Eissfeldt into the Book of Judges in 1925. The documents were brought together in the following order: L+J by RJ, LJ+E by RE. L belonged perhaps to the time of Elijah, and represented, like him, loyalty to the old nomadic ideals and hostility to the influence of Canaan upon Hebrew life. Eissfeldt also, like Smend, questions the com-

[11] Otto Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse u.s.w.* (1922), and *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (1925).

mon location of J in Judah and of E in Ephraim. He emphasizes the spiritual unity of the two regions, which persisted even after they became politically hostile. He likewise assigns to E the origin of the so-called "Deuteronomic pragmatism," and so much enlarges the scope of E, correspondingly reducing the limits of D in the narratives of the Pentateuch.

Deuteronomy has long been regarded as the corner-stone of the modern critical structure. But within recent years scholars have been trying to move it hither and thither. R. H. Kennett[12] started the discussion in 1906 by claiming that a comparison of Deuteronomy with Jeremiah shows that the former was largely dependent upon the latter for its thought and phraseology. Similarly, comparison with the Holiness Code shows that Deuteronomy's legislation is much more drastic, and so later, than H. These things, together with some facts hard to explain upon the theory of pre-exilic origin, led Kennett to place the original Deuteronomic Code about 520 B.C., a century later than Josiah's reformation.[13] G. Hölscher, in 1922, published a long discussion of the composition and date of Deuteronomy in which he independently came to a similar result.[14] On the basis of a close analysis of the text, Hölscher decides that the hypothesis of separate editions of Deuteronomy, each with its own introduction, is unwarranted. He prefers to say that the original Deuteronomy began with 6:4 and is continued through the Code as far as chapter 28, and that it is to be found in the passages written in the second

[12] R. H. Kennett, "The Date of Deuteronomy," *Journal of Theological Studies* (1906).

[13] G. R. Berry *Journal of Biblical Literature,* XXXIX (1920). 44–51, using largely the same arguments, arrived at a much similar conclusion.

[14] G. Hölscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomium," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* XL, 161–255.

person singular. This original book was then supplemented from time to time by later hands. Having formulated his original code, Hölscher goes on to show that its legislation is to such an extent ideal and unreal that it cannot be thought of as having originated amid the actualities and realities of the pre-exilic state. He also claims that the original Jeremiah shows no knowledge of the Deuteronomic law.

In the contrary direction runs the conclusion of Professor A. C. Welch, who has recently published a book on Deuteronomy.[15] He emphasizes the early character of many of the statutes, and claims that, apart from 12:1–7, the code does not demand centralization of worship at one sanctuary. "The place which Yahweh shall choose" might be any one of many sanctuaries. The original code, therefore, belongs to the early days of the Northern Kingdom, and 12:1–7 is an adaptation of the code to later conditions.

The early origin of much of the legislation now found in Deuteronomy has long been granted by critics. As a matter of fact, Deuteronomy is in large part a revision of the Covenant Code (Exodus 20:23—23:33). So the presence of old laws in a code proves nothing as to the date of the code itself. As to the significance of the phrase, "the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose," it need only be said that if this can be made to mean "any place, etc." it is a case of ambiguity of phraseology almost unpardonable in a code of law. As a matter of fact Hebrew was as capable of distinguishing clearly between "the one place" and "any place" as is English, and the form used here is that indicative of one place and one place only. The most natural way to say what Welch desires

[15] A. C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (1924).

would have been "the places which Yahweh shall choose in all of thy tribes."

Hölscher's claim for a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy fails to realize that the things he makes post-exilic were already in existence in the pre-exilic period. The failure to reckon with hard facts was no stranger to pre-exilic thinking. When Isaiah dared to promise Ahaz any miracle he might demand, he was not moving in the sphere of reality. The fact that the high places were still in use after the reform of Josiah is but an evidence of the familiar fact that institutions and customs which have obtained for centuries are not done away with completely overnight. The attack upon the critical position at this point may be considered as successfully repulsed for the present.[16]

The literary criticism of the writings of the prophets has taken no great strides in the last quarter of a century. Duhm's *Commentary* (1892) had already proposed setting aside chapters 56–66 of the Book of Isaiah as the work of a Trito-Isaiah. Cheyne's *Introduction* (1895) had made the analysis of Isaiah a familiar thing for English scholarship. Marti,[17] writing at the beginning of our century, accepted the chief results of both his predecessors, but pushed the analysis of Isaiah, chapters 1–39, farther than either of them, and departed from Duhm in that he held the Servant Songs to be an original part of Isaiah, chapters 40–55. The main work on Isaiah, chapters 1–39, has been done by Fullerton in a series

[16] For criticisms of Welch and Hölscher, see H. Gressman, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLII, 313–37; W. Nowack, in Marti's *Festschrift* (*Beihefte zur Z.A.W.*, XLI [1925]), 221–31.

[17] *Das Buch Jesaja erklärt (Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, 1900).

of articles[18] in which he presented powerful arguments against Isaiah's authorship of the messianic chapters in Isaiah, chapters 1–39.[19] Budde has subjected Fullerton's views to thoroughgoing criticism;[20] but without any appreciable weakening of his position. The chief results of the criticism of Isaiah are (1) a clear-cut picture of the Isaiah of the eighth century B.C., and (2) a recognition of the fact that Isaiah, chapters 56–66, is not a unit, but the product of various minds.

In the case of Jeremiah, there has been an increasing appreciation of the prophet's personality. Duhm's *Commentary*[21] at the opening of the century discriminated sharply between the genuine utterances of Jeremiah and those of Baruch, on the one hand, and the additions of later editors, on the other hand. Duhm went too far in his criticism, in that he insisted that Jeremiah wrote only 4-lined strophes in *Qinah,* or elegiac, measure. It is wholly unreasonable to suppose that a man of as great mentality as Jeremiah and of as much originality of expression should have been confined for the expression of his thought to one stereotyped form, and that, too, a form not well adapted to the utterance of all kinds of thought and feeling. Duhm's work, however, marked a new departure in the study of Jeremiah and stimulated much new work.

Four outstanding books[22] on Jeremiah have appeared

[18] Chiefly in *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature,* Vol. XXXIV (1917); Vol. XLII (1925).

[19] Cf. J. M. Powis Smith, "Isaiah and the Future," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature,* XL (1924), 252–58.

[20] K. Budde, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* XLI (1923), 154–203.

[21] *Das Buch Jeremia (Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament,* 1901).

[22] C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia erklärt* (1905); A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah* (1912); J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion—Studies in the Life of Jeremiah* (1922); and G. Adam Smith, *Jeremiah* (1923).

since 1901, one by C. H. Cornill, another by Principal John Skinner, the third by Sir George Adam Smith, and the fourth by A. S. Peake. These with one consent have gone a different way from that of Duhm, but their whole approach to the study of Jeremiah has been greatly influenced by his work. Cornill throws off the formal limits of the *Qinah* measure and the four-line stanza and thus liberates the spirit of Jeremiah. He assigns to Jeremiah's own hand all the poetic material that speaks in the first person, and divides the narrative in the third person between Baruch and later editors. The most important difference from Duhm is the retention of Jeremiah 31:31–34, the oracle on the New Covenant, as the prophet's own work. This makes Jeremiah the originator of the principle that true religion is a matter of the heart, that is, it must spring up from within and can never be imposed from without. Cornill's position is essentially that of the three British scholars, all of whom hold fast to the New Covenant oracle as Jeremiah's own.

At the beginning of this century Kraetzschmar[23] presented the generally accepted opinion upon the Book of Ezekiel. There had not been wanting scholars who denied certain parts of the book to Ezekiel, or even put the entire work as far down as the Maccabean period. But Kraetzschmar contented himself with the hypothesis of an editor who brought together the utterances of Ezekiel into book form. This editor brought together two separate recensions of the text which had already been liberally edited after leaving the hand of Ezekiel. The only passage Kraetzschmar denied outright to Ezekiel was chapter 3:16*b*–21, and that was thought of by him as very closely dependent upon the thought of Ezekiel.

[23] *Das Buch Ezechiel übersetzt und erklärt* (1900).

In 1908 J. Herrmann contributed a set of studies on Ezekiel[24] in which he went a bit farther than Kraetzschmar in eliminating foreign elements. But the essential integrity of the book was not seriously impeached. It remained for G. Hölscher[25] to present a completely changed view of the prophet Ezekiel and his book. He introduces us to an Ezekiel who is primarily a prophet and a poet, and in no sense a legalist or a prosy homilist. The legalistic and ritualistic matter in the book is all the work of later writers who completely transformed the work of the original prophet. All hope is taken from his message. The original book was organized by the first redactor in the fifth century B.C., but received many additions from later hands. The degree to which Hölscher finds it necessary to revise the commonly accepted view of the book is illustrated by the fact that he denies Ezekiel's authorship of chapters 34–48 in toto. Out of a total of 1,273 verses in his book, Ezekiel is allowed to retain for himself less than 200. The future will deal with this view severely, if I mistake not.

In the third division of the Hebrew canon, viz., The Writings, the two outstanding books are Job and the Psalms. Literary criticism has not neglected these in the last twenty-five years. In the second edition of his commentary, which appeared in 1897, Baethgen[26] came to the conclusion that forty or fifty of the psalms came from the pre-exilic period, that Psalm 18 in its original form was written by David, and that

[24] J. Herrmann, *Ezechielstudien* (1908). In his commentary on Ezekiel which appeared in 1924 Herrmann has made no important change in his literary analysis as worked out in the earlier studies.

[25] See G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (1914), pp. 298–315; *idem, Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (1922); and especially *idem, Hesekiel der Dichter und das Buch* (1924).

[26] F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt* (1897).

Psalms 44, 74, 79, and 83 were certainly of Maccabean origin, while eight others were probably, or at least possibly, to be placed in that period. The only two commentaries of the first rank since that time have been those of C. A. Briggs[27] and B. Duhm.[28] The work of Briggs in the field of literary criticism was so arbitrary and subjective as to have left no mark upon the history of thought. It consisted largely in the analysis of each individual psalm into its supposed constituent elements, the determining elements being very largely drawn from the area of poetic structure, regarding which not enough is known even yet to warrant its use as a controlling guide in such matters. Duhm denies the existence of any Davidic psalms in the Psalter. He regards Psalm 137 as the oldest psalm. He doubts the existence of any psalms from the Persian period, and finds most of the Psalter in the Greek period. The Maccabean age is credited with many psalms, and the period of psalm production is extended as far down as the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (105–76 B.C.). Sellin, a fairly conservative scholar, in a recent book[29] has taken a much more cautious position. For him there are no psalms of later origin than the fourth century B.C. To the time of Hezekiah are assigned Psalms 2–41 and 51–72, while David is given credit for Psalm 18 and ten others. Steuernagel, in his *Einleitung*,[30] allows pre-exilic origin for a few psalms, but declares that in general the individual psalms were written not long before the collections in which they are found were formed. Hence the

[27] C. A. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (1906–7).

[28] B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen erklärt*, 2d ed. (1922).

[29] Ernst Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1923).

[30] Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1912).

psalms in Books 4 and 5 belong somewhere around 400 B.C.; those in Books 2 and 3, somewhere about 450 B.C.; and those in Book 1 are in part, at least, considerably older, some going back into the pre-exilic age. With reference to the Maccabean origin of certain psalms, Steuernagel renders a Scotch verdict of "not proven," rightly emphasizing the fact that we do not know the historical conditions of the post-exilic period thoroughly enough to enable us to say that only Maccabean conditions suit this or that psalm. A thoroughgoing historical study of the Psalter is at present a great desideratum.

The Book of Job has received much attention since 1900. Five commentaries of the first rank have appeared,[31] not to speak of many significant articles. Earlier scholarship had attacked many sections of Job, and especially the speeches of Elihu, and brought them down to much later times. Budde, however, defended the essential integrity of the entire book, eliminating only a few brief passages here and there and putting the composition of the entire book about 400 B.C. Budde's work stopped the dissecting process but a moment. Jastrow's original Book of Job contained only chapters 1–27 of the present text. All the rest came in by later accretion. Not only so, but the original twenty-seven chapters suffered a great deal of change at the hands of orthodox editors. Driver and Gray, two essentially conservative scholars, called a halt again the next year, reverting to a much more cautious position. For them the only later elements of any great extent were the discourse on Wisdom (chapter 28), the speeches of

[31] Karl Budde, *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt,* 2d ed. (1913); Morris Jastrow, *The Book of Job—Its Origin, Growth, and Interpretation* (1920); S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (1921); Moses Buttenwieser, *The Book of Job* (1922); C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job* (1922).

Elihu (chapters 32–37), and the descriptions of the Leviathan and Behemoth in the Speech of Yahweh (40:6—41:34). Ball made no contribution on the side of literary analysis, simply reaffirming the position of Driver and Gray. Buttenwieser, however, struck out upon a new path. The only later additions of any importance found by him are the Elihu speeches and the descriptions of the hippopotamus and crocodile in the Speeches of Yahweh. But he rearranges *ad libitum* the contents of the original book. He is not content with reorganizing the third cycle of the debate with practically all scholars, but considers Job's speeches throughout the book to have been just as badly treated as the third cycle, and undertakes to restore their original order. Job's speech that begins with chapter 19, for example, is made up of the following elements: 19:1–10, 12*a*; 30:12*a*–13*b*, 14; 19:7; 30:20, 21, 15*b*, *c*, 15*a*, 16, 27*a*, 17*b*, 30*a*, 17*a*, 30*b*; 19:20; 30:28*a*, 29, 31; 19:13–19, 21–29. Such work can never be anything but conjectural. If any such dislocation ever occurred, the chance of recovering the original order is but one in a thousand. What may be regarded as fairly well-assured results to date are (1) the fact that the original speeches of the friends in the third cycle have been transferred in part to Job; (2) the later origin of the Elihu speeches and of chapter 28, and of the descriptions of the Behemoth and Leviathan in the Yahweh speeches.

On the whole it may be said that literary criticism has done its work for the present. The future belongs to other interests. Literary criticism will never be out of date, but its most important results probably lie in the past. The most profitable fields of investigation now lie in the domains of general oriental culture and the history of religion. These have

not been wholly ignored thus far, but much more remains to be done. The last quarter of a century has seen the rise and fall of various theories relating Israel to the outside world. Among these was Cheyne's Jerahmeel hypothesis, which would trace everything of value in Hebrew thought and life back to the Negeb, south of Judah, and would accomplish its goal by changing most of the ancient Hebrew names into "Jerahmeel" or some other closely related name. Alongside of this may be placed Winckler's Musri hypothesis, which has likewise gone its way never to return. This would have transferred all the Egyptian experiences and contacts of Israel to a vague region called Musri. Closely related to this in spirit was Clay's attempt to rehabilitate the Old Testament by locating the origin of all the major ideas, institutions, and personalities of the early Oriental world in a region called Amurru, the dwelling-place of the early Hebrews. Unfortunately the land of Amurru would not stay put; in each new publication Clay found it necessary to locate it afresh in a new spot. Of quite contrary character was the *Babel und Bibel* controversy. Delitzsch and others sought to rob the Old Testament of all its glory and hand it over to the Babylonians. But all these views have had their day and ceased to be. Yet we are more sure today than ever before that Israel's life was closely interwoven with that of the surrounding peoples and that they borrowed freely from the neighboring civilizations. Not only Babylon and Egypt, but also the Hittites contributed much to the content of Hebrew thought and life. The scholars of tomorrow will find more Babylonian, and still more Egyptian goods in the Hebrew market than we have as yet thought of. The merit of Israel was not so much in its power to create things *ex nihilo,* but rather in its wonderful ability to

transform and enrich things it received from the hands of other peoples.[32]

The last quarter of a century has seen the production of a great quantity of sound exegetical work: Three great series of commentaries have marked the period, e.g., *The International Critical Commentary,* Nowack's *Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament,* and Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament.* The one outstanding exegetical work of the period has been Ehrlich's *Randglossen zum Alten Testament,* which abounds in fresh and original suggestions, though caution must be exercised in its use.

In the field of Hebrew history two standard works have appeared in this period, viz., H. P. Smith's *Old Testament History* (1903), and R. Kittel's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (4th ed., 1922).[33] These two works gathered up the results generally accepted at the time they were written, Kittel from a conservative critical point of view, and Smith from a more aggressive point of view.[34]

Aside from the contributions made to the study of Hebrew history by the finds of the excavators and archaeologists,[35] the most important change has been in the attitude of scholarship toward the early history of Israel. The start in this direction was given by Eduard Meyer's *Die Israeliten und ihre*

[32] For illustrations of this, see my article on "Archaeology and the Old Testament," *Journal of Religion,* May, 1926.

[33] Originally published as *Geschichte der Hebräer* (1888–92) and translated into English as *History of the Hebrews* (1895–96). An excellent study of Hebrew history in its relations to other peoples is furnished by Lehmann-Haupt, *Israel—Seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte* (1911).

[34] A brilliantly written history of the pre-exilic period in which present-day conclusions are well represented is Carleton E. Noyes, *The Genius of Israel* (1924).

[35] See *Journal of Religion,* VI (1926), 284–301.

Nachbarstämme (1906). The movement was carried on in this country by a series of articles from a group of Chicago scholars, viz., D. D. Luckenbill, T. J. Meek, L. Waterman, and J. M. Powis Smith.[36] From these studies a new approach to the early Canaanitish period of Hebrew history results. It is no longer thought that the Joshua account of the conquest and settlement is to be taken seriously. It is rather felt that the settlement in Canaan was a long-drawn-out process, being undertaken by different groups of Hebrews, from different directions and at widely separated times. The region of Judah was settled last of all. It is also clearer than ever that the common view that traces all Hebrew law back to Sinai is far from correct, but that the dependence of the Hebrew legislation upon pre-existing Babylonian legislation domiciled in Canaan is very great.

In the study of prophecy, aside from questions of literary criticism, the new thing is the recognition of the importance of the psychological approach to the understanding of the prophets that has come in during the last decade. This aspect of prophecy has not as yet come into its own, but a good beginning has been made. The books in which this side of the prophetic activity has been clearly recognized are G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (1914); T. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets* (1923); John Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*

[36] J. M. Powis Smith, "Some Problems in Early Hebrew Religion," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* XXXII (1915), 81–97; D. D. Luckenbill, "On Israel's Origins," *American Journal of Theology,* XXII (1918), 24–53; J. M. Powis Smith, "Southern Influences on Early Hebrew Prophecy," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* XXXV (1918), 1–19; T. J. Meek, "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," *ibid.,* XXXVII (1920), 101–31; L. Waterman, "Pre-Israelitish Laws in the Book of the Covenant," *ibid.,* XXXVIII (1921), 36–54; T. J. Meek, "A Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History," *American Journal of Theology,* XXIV (1920), 209–16.

(1922); and my own *Prophets and Their Times* (1925). In addition to these, attention should be called to two excellent theses upon this subject by D. E. Thomas and H. W. Hines.[37] The work of the latter particularly brings out the close parallels between the experiences of the prophets and those of the mystics. This point of view makes some experiences of the prophets quite intelligible which have heretofore defied analysis.

We close our survey of the period before us with a brief look upon the fields of ethics and religion. Everything else makes its contribution to these interests. The last twenty-five years have seen the appearance of several standard works in this area.[38] This period has marked the transfer from books on "theology" to those on the "history of religion." Stade's work retains the old title, but has completely abandoned the old point of view that went with the title. It has come to be clearly recognized that ideas are not a thing apart from life, but that they are of its very warp and woof. To understand them, therefore, in any thoroughgoing way, it is necessary to relate them to their background and to study the social, economic, political, and international relations out of which they sprang. This means a genuinely historical approach to the study of Hebrew religion. Peters' book falls short of this high mark somewhat, by reason of certain theological presupposi-

[37] D. E. Thomas, "A Psychological Approach to the Study of Prophecy," *American Journal of Theology*, XVIII (1914), 241–56; H. W. Hines, "The Prophet as Mystic," *ibid.*, XL (1923), 37–71.

[38] E. Kautzsch, "Religion of Israel," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1904); H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905); B. Stade und A. Bertholet, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments* (1905–11); H. G. Mitchell, *Ethics of the Old Testament* (1912); J. P. Peters, *Religion of the Hebrews* (1914); H. P. Smith, *Religion of the Old Testament* (1914); J. M. Powis Smith, *The Moral Life of the Hebrews* (1922).

tions that crop out here and here. Mitchell likewise fails to attain perfection, not because of any theological prejudices, however, but rather because of his inability to relate literature to life, so that his pages are burdened by a deadly monotony and flatness. Gressmann's book represents a brave attempt to rehabilitate the eschatological utterances of the pre-exilic prophets by positing a general eschatological interpretation of the universe as having existed in the ancient oriental world from time immemorial. The Hebrews shared this view with the rest of their neighbors, but gradually spiritualized and ethicized it as was their wont. Any such comprehensive eschatological world-view as Gressmann imagines fails to prove its existence in known historical documents. Still further, the great prophets of Israel had no sympathy with such comprehensive other-worldly views as these, as may be seen, for example, in Amos' protest against the popular belief in a day of Yahweh that should bring all Israel's troubles to an end and usher in an era of glory for the people of Yahweh (Amos 5:18 ff.). Another theory which has had its day is the Kenite hypothesis. Budde, in his American Lectures,[39] gave that theory a new lease of life. The theory, in brief, was that Israel first became acquainted with Yahweh at Mount Sinai; that there they chose him of their own free will to be Israel's God; and that by this act of free will they started Israel's religion on its high ethical course. For a decade or so this theory bade fair to carry everything before it. But within the last decade facts have put increasing obstacles in its way, and today the Kenite hypothesis is practically a thing of the past.

The one thing that stands out with increasing prominence today as the result of the work of the last quarter of a century

[39] K. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile* (1899).

is the fact that Hebrew life and thought cannot be properly understood when considered by themselves alone. The Hebrews formed part of a great family of nations constituting the Semitic group. These shared common institutions, instincts, and ideas. They carried on with one another a constant exchange of goods, both material and ethereal. There was a never ceasing process of give-and-take going on among them. There was no tariff wall to keep out ideas and customs. The languages of the Semitic group were very much alike, so that intercommunication was not seriously hampered by difficulties of speech. Phoenicians, Aramaeans, Moabites, Ammonites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Hebrews were all in the same school of life together, influenced largely by similar geographical, geological, and climatic conditions and learning much from one another. The Hebrews were not dull pupils in this school. They had open eyes and quick ears for all that was going on. They absorbed much from their neighbors' experience and brought it forth again after passing it through the mill of their own minds and hearts greatly refined and purified.

The Hebrews entering Canaan from the desert, for example, found themselves faced by a civilization that was hoary with age and as advanced in its institutions as that of any people on the face of the earth at that time. The Hebrews might conceivably have destroyed that civilization root and branch, and then set about rebuilding a civilization of their own in place of that which they had destroyed. But they did no such thing. Rather they set about appropriating that civilization for themselves. This was a much more sensible and practical method of procedure. They saved themselves no end of hard physical labor and suffering by thus entering at once into possession of the achievements of their predecessors. The energy

that would otherwise have been expended in useless labor was thus left free to express itself in more creative fashion through the working out of contributions to the solution of the moral and spiritual problems of life. That their borrowings from Canaanitish civilization did not confine themselves to secular things may be illustrated by two facts. The three agricultural feasts celebrated annually by the Hebrews were adopted and adapted from their Canaanitish predecessors. But whereas these nature feasts of the Canaanites had been celebrated in honor of the Baalim, in the hands of the Hebrews they became feasts of Yahweh. They are known to us as the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which was celebrated in the springtime; the Feast of Weeks, which came at the close of the grain harvest; and the Feast of Tabernacles, which fell at the close of the ingathering of the fruit, oil, and wine in the autumn. These were elements coming close to the heart of religion itself, and yet the Hebrews did not shrink from reaching over into Baalism and appropriating for Yahwism one of the leading institutions of its vigorous rival. The second illustration of this same attitude of mind is found in the Hebrew law itself. The civilization of Canaan was organized under the law of the dominant Babylonian empire. That law was what we know as the Code of Hammurabi. Its statutes were in force throughout the whole area of the Babylonian dominion. Again the Hebrews might have rejected the whole social and industrial order of Canaan with its controlling code of laws, but they did no such foolish and wasteful thing. On the contrary, they took up a large part of the Canaanitish law bodily into their own legislation, adapting it to suit their own needs and ideals. In the Covenant Code, for example, now found in Exodus 20:23—23:33, the order and arrangement of the separate laws is the

same as that found in the Code of Hammurabi. Not only so, but more than 50 per cent of the statutes of the Covenant Code are practically identical with corresponding statutes in the Code of Hammurabi. Evidently the Hebrews were not restrained by any narrow prejudices from availing themselves of the best their neighbors had to offer.

The same use of their environment is seen in the fact that Hebrew monotheism was largely due to the influence of Assyria upon Hebrew history. The Hebrews, who, like all other Semites, had worshiped a national God, were forced by the course of history to enlarge their conception of God. They saw the Assyrian armies sweeping everything before them and wiping one nation after another out of existence. In due time they themselves went the way of all the rest. As long as they continued to interpret the world in terms of national gods there was no alternative but to acknowledge the Assyrian gods as the most powerful and to do obeisance to them in the name of Yahweh. To have done so would have been a fatal blow to their national pride and would have meant surrendering Yahweh's claim to supreme power. This they refused to do. Their loyalty to Yahweh could not tolerate such a thought. The only way to escape was to make Yahweh the God of the world and so to interpret all of Assyria's victories as ordered of Yahweh, who had chosen Assyria as the rod of his anger against the peoples of the earth in general and Israel in particular. This interpretation gave Yahweh the supreme place among the gods and forced Israel to ethicize its own ways in response to the requirements of an implacable God of justice.

Another type of enrichment that came to Israel from its Semitic kinsmen may be seen in the writings of Ezekiel and

Deutero-Isaiah. The exiles among whom these writings originated were surrounded by visible signs and expressions of idolatry on every hand. The shrines of the Babylonian gods were equipped with a splendor beside which that of the most luxurious of Hebrew shrines paled into insignificance. From the elaborate ritual which constantly confronted him Ezekiel drew much of the description of the imagery of the strange and complex figures seen in his various visions. The glories of Yahweh should not be outshone by any splendors of the Babylonian deities, so the equipment of Yahweh's throne and temple is enriched by the addition of Babylonian trappings. The writer of Deutero-Isaiah, on the other hand, being surrounded by evidences of the wealth and power of the Babylonian gods, takes account of them in two ways. He directly attacks them by sarcasm and irony as lifeless and impotent blocks of wood, thus giving us the most effective exposé of the futility of idolatry in the Old Testament. He goes on to describe in eloquent and impressive terms the omnipotence and omniscience of Yahweh, Israel's God. The whole presentation constitutes the most effective and glowing argument for the sole supremacy of Yahweh as God of the Universe that the Old Testament contains.

That Israel did not limit its borrowings to members of the Semitic family alone has become more and more evident in recent years. They learned from all with whom they came in contact. The Jewish nose came from the Hittites by intermarriage. The belief in a worth-while existence of the individual after death was probably greatly strengthened by contact with the rich eschatology of Persia. The more philosophical elements in Hebrew literature, like the Book of Ecclesiastes and Proverbs 30:1–4, seem to bear the impress of Greek

thought during the centuries immediately after 333 B.C., when Alexander became ruler of the known world. But to Egypt above all among the non-Semitic peoples was the debt of Judaism the heaviest. To say nothing of the contribution of Egypt to the civilization of Canaan which Israel inherited and appropriated, we have positive evidence of direct Egyptian influence in some indisputable passages of Old Testament literature. To what extent, if any, prophecy as a whole was due to Egyptian contact is today an open question. But that the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife was influenced by the Egyptian Tale of Two Brothers can hardly be doubted. No better example than this could be desired of the degree to which the Hebrew mind ennobled whatever it touched. It is likewise altogether probable that the expression in Malachi 4:2, "the sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in its wings," had its origin in observation of the winged disk of the sun god so commonly used in Egypt. But more convincing than anything else is the fact, recently discovered, that Proverbs 22:17 ff. is largely a collection of proverbs borrowed directly from an Egyptian writing of the 11th century B.C., known as The Teaching of Amen-em-ope. These Egyptian proverbs were taken over verbatim by the Hebrew editor, in so far as he could use them in a collection of Yahweh literature, and were sent forth by him as materials for the instruction of Hebrew youth in the right way of living. Such a discovery is clear demonstration of the open-mindedness and catholicity of at least one Hebrew contributor to the literature of the Old Testament.

In the face of an increasing accumulation of facts like these there is need today of a new writing of the religion of Israel and of a new study of messianic prophecy. There is no

modern book on the latter subject, which was once so fertile a field of cultivation. The new record would be radically different from the old apologetic treatises. It would be destructive of all their cherished illusions. But the time has passed in Old Testament interpretation for anybody to be deterred from recording the truth by fear of the consequences. The reading of the Assuan papyri, the decipherment of the Sinai inscriptions, and the more complete knowledge now available of the relationships between Israel and the surrounding nations combine to make a new history of Hebrew religion necessary. The men who would do these things must be a good deal more than mere Hebraists. The study of Hebrew religion today is inseparably linked up with that of Assyrians, Babylonians, Hittites, Egyptians, Persians, and Greeks. It calls for an all-around historical and linguistic training. Yet in recent years Hebrew and linguistic studies have been made optional in nearly all our seminaries, so that the difficulty of finding men properly equipped for the conduct of research work in these fields is becoming greatly accentuated. The prospects of such work are exceedingly bright. The scholar who undertakes it with open mind and unflagging zeal may count with certainty upon discoveries that will bring with them their own reward.

THE LIFE OF JESUS

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

At the dawn of the twentieth century, Christendom's interest in the life and teaching of Jesus had crystallized along certain well-defined lines. The literature on the subject was now considerable in extent and varied in character. Especially in Germany, it had been accumulating rapidly during the latter part of the preceding century in response to a new critical interest that had awakened the curiosity and stimulated the activity of investigators. Although several scholars had attempted to estimate constructively the more recent findings of critical inquiry, these studies had not produced general satisfaction. The problem of a final "Life of Jesus" was far from solved by the opening of the twentieth century.

I

The preceding centuries had bequeathed to the twentieth a varied heritage. Within Roman Catholicism biographical interest in Jesus had developed certain clearly recognizable types. The story of his life had been vividly portrayed in the language of art. Worshippers gazed upon the picture of the Christ-child, they beheld the God-man ministering as a good shepherd, blessing little children, and feeding the poor, they saw him in heavenly glory on the mountain of transfiguration, they bowed in reverence before him hanging on the cross, and they witnessed scenes symbolic of his triumphant resurrection. Pictured in this realistic fashion, in its art, its music, and its ritual, the story of Jesus' career had been written into

the heart of Catholic piety more effectively than would have been possible through the medium of any printed page.

Yet Catholic Christianity was not entirely lacking in books whose authors also depicted vividly the story of Jesus' life primarily for the purpose of making him an object of adoration and a source of emotional uplift. These books, written in the interest of practical piety, drew their inspiration more largely from the area of mystical contemplation and pious fancy than from any attempt at historical research. An edifying legend was as appropriate in such a work as was the most certainly verifiable fact in an ancient source. Lives of Jesus, composed in this spirit, produced essentially the same effect as did the Jesus of Roman Catholic art and ritual. This Jesus of popular piety was still a familiar figure in the Roman Catholicism of the early twentieth century.

In very similar fashion within Protestantism also, Jesus had been made to serve the interests of edification. To be sure, Protestants could not appropriate the art and ritual of Catholicism, and their exaltation of the authority of the Scriptures made it necessary to discard the apocryphal legends with which Catholic piety had so extensively supplemented the gospel narratives. But in the New Testament gospels themselves, Protestants, like their Catholic contemporaries, found a Jesus who was a fitting object of adoration and worship. The dominating incentive prompting one to rehearse the story of his life was a desire to portray him as the adorable Christ of faith. Even as late as the close of the nineteenth century, this type of "Life of Jesus" was still widely in demand within Protestantism. Its popularity had as yet been very little disturbed by the new scientific and historical

interests that had grown up during the latter part of the century.

There was still another distinct type of "Life of Jesus" that had become very well known before the beginning of the twentieth century. It had been created by orthodox scholars in an effort to counteract the disturbing results that seemed likely to attend the critical researches of the more liberal school that had emerged, especially within Protestantism, during the nineteenth century. These authors were concerned to preserve a Christ worthy of faith and worship, but they employed the method of the apologist for christological dogma. Practical piety had not fed upon logic; it had rested on an attitude rather than on an argument. Neither Catholic nor Protestant pietistic feeling relied on argument for the godhead of Jesus, for his sinlessness, or for the truth of any item in theology. Conviction was produced by means of vivid portrayal. But the apologetic biographer of Jesus adopted a different course. He wrote to defend doctrines about Jesus at every point in the story of his career where the new criticism might cast doubt upon the elaborate christological structure of orthodoxy. Among both Catholics and Protestants the apologetic type of "Life" had gained wide vogue by the close of the nineteenth century.

It was the critical method of study that constituted the great contribution of the nineteenth century to the twentieth. At the outset criticism had been concerned primarily with the problem of miracle, and its point of departure had been dissatisfaction with current christological dogma. It questioned both the dogma of an infallible Scripture, and the miraculous features in the gospels. The truth of religion was sought in the realm of the moral and spiritual. Strauss' *Life of Jesus* in Germany, Renan's in France, and the anonymous *Ecce Homo*

in England, are outstanding examples of this new tendency. These books were still in circulation at the beginning of the twentieth century, and others of similar type were occasionally appearing, yet among critical scholars this deliberate antagonism to the miraculous had been giving place to other interests. The crass supernaturalism of orthodoxy was no longer laboriously berated; it was practically ignored, as constructive work along critical lines was attempted in new fields of research.

Perhaps the most significant heritage which the nineteenth century bequeathed to the twentieth was its critical study of the New Testament books, particularly of the gospels, as sources of information about the life and teaching of Jesus. This line of investigation had been pursued with vigor all through the latter part of the nineteenth century, and its more substantial results had come to be regarded as a permanent possession of scholarship. Its principal findings were to the effect that the Gospel of John was a late and arbitrary work, in comparison with the other three gospels. Matthew and Luke were believed to have been of later origin than Mark, which had constituted one of their principal sources. In addition to Mark they had also employed another body of common material termed the Logia (later called "Q") which seemed to most scholars to be a homogeneous body of material assignable to an original single document. Some critics, however, thought that it might have been a multiple source.

Still another gift from the nineteenth century was an enlarged acquaintance with later Jewish literature. When canonicity had been the accepted test of historical worth, students of the life of Jesus would pass directly from the Old Testament to the New. In the Old they discovered prophecies referring to the coming of Christ, and in the New they saw the

fulfilment of prophecy. But during the latter half of the nineteenth century, diligent search had been made into the later Jewish books, with a view to reconstructing the history of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus himself. By the close of the century, scholars had not only attained a keener appreciation of the total life of the Jewish people contemporary with Jesus, but their attention had been arrested by one particular phase of this later literature, namely the apocalyptic books. Their expectations of a sudden coming of the end of the present world and the advent of a Messiah who would be revealed directly out of heaven, seemed especially important for the interpretation of the similar type of thinking so apparent in the gospels.

II

Such were the main characteristics of the setting in which students of the life of Jesus found themselves at the beginning of the twentieth century.[1] The variety of work that has been done during the last twenty-five years has been almost wholly a result of the continuation of one or another of these earlier interests. Nor is there a single one of them that has lacked a champion. Apparently the world of scholarship has been so engrossed in the pursuit of those particular problems that were bequeathed to the twentieth century by its predecessor, that little energy has been left for strictly new creative endeavor.

Lives of Jesus in which edification constitutes the principal motive of the author continue to appear with amazing frequency. In Catholicism, the recent book by the Italian

[1] An excellent critical summary of nineteenth-century study on the life of Jesus has been made by A. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen, 1906; 2. Aufl., 1913), translated by W. Montgomery, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London, 1910).

Papini[2] overshadows all rivals, but the more recent work of the Spaniard Miró[3] might well prove a strong competitor. Neither writer has the slightest concern with historical study in the critical sense of the word, but each gives free play to his own artistic imagination. And the result in each case is a characteristically medieval picture of a Jesus vividly portrayed to the emotions and capable of stimulating a medieval type of mystical feeling. Modern Catholicism has also produced some recent examples of the apologetic type of life of Jesus.[4] The authors of these books show familiarity with the problems that have been raised by critical scholars. Yet none of the modern study is allowed to interfere in the least with standard items in orthodox christological dogma. Historical criticism is recognized only that it may be refuted, and it is refuted by summary dismissal, in order that the postulates of traditionalism may stand without disturbance.

In Protestant circles, Jesus as an object of popular religious idealism has been widely and variously exploited during the last quarter century. There is hardly an area of modern religious interest where Jesus has not been himself made the ideal modern man. The increasing variety and complexity of life within Protestantism in recent years has furnished a great many different garments with which to adorn the figure of Jesus. Every shade of modern activity which has behind it

[2] G. Papini, *La Storia di Cristo* (Firenze, 1922), translated by Dorothy Canfield Fisher, *Life of Christ* (New York, 1923).

[3] G. Miró, *Figures of the Passion of Our Lord,* translated from the Spanish by C. J. Hogarth (New York, 1924).

[4] For older books of this class see Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* pp. 294 f. Recent typical illustrations are A. Dufourcq, *La Révolution religieuse. Jésus.* 5e éd. (Paris, 1924); A. Reatz, *Jesus Christus, Sein Leben, seine Lehre und sein Werk* (Freiburg, 1924).

the inspiration of a religious impulse depicts Jesus in accordance with its own immediate interests and ideals. He is made the authoritative teacher for a modern social order, or even an exemplary social reformer himself. Some interpreters have made him the ideal pacifist, while others would see in him the ideal belligerent. At other times he becomes an ideal for the man of affairs, or the model for a Y.M.C.A. worker. In short, whatever one thinks the ideal Christian for today to be in one's own particular area of experience and activity, it is natural and proper to make Jesus just that sort of person.[5]

The apologetic "Life of Jesus" has perpetuated itself also among Protestants, where today it has perhaps even a wider vogue than among Catholics. Mechanically, it is constructed by carefully weaving together all four of the gospel records into one harmonious whole. Seeming discrepancies or contradictions are explained away, canonicity being regarded as an adequate test of historicity. Even when this traditional view of scriptural authority is not explicitly affirmed, it still operates unconsciously and effectively. The dependability of the gospel records, just because they are the gospels, is a fundamental consideration, and the aim of a "Life of Jesus" is mainly christological. An author writes to show that history supports all of the traditional tenets of christological doctrine. Even though slight concessions may now and then

[5] There is almost no limit to the number of such books. Some of the most glaring recent examples are V. G. Simkhovitch, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus* (New York, 1921), who in the fashion of Tolstoi paints the pacifist Jesus, whose very death was due to his rigid anti-militarism; Bruce Barton, *The Man Nobody Knows* (New York, 1925), to whom Jesus seems a typical modern hustler; Mary Austin, *A Small Town Man* (New York, 1925), who would have one believe that Jesus was a typical religious mystic. These writers do not trouble themselves "to utilize critical literature," as Simkhovitch naïvely confesses. They would seem to have a native intuition for understanding Jesus that makes critical historical scrutiny of sources quite unnecessary.

be made to critics of the gospels, or to doubters of miracles, the main features of traditionalism are still preserved.[6]

In contrast with these conservative survivals the twentieth century has witnessed a vigorous propaganda for the contention that Jesus never lived at all. In the first decade of the century this skeptical movement, which had not been lacking, however, in the nineteenth century, came to new life. It first appeared in Germany and in England, and more recently it has been revived in France.[7] Its main contention is that the Jesus of the gospel story is too thoroughly a God ever to have been a real man. The evolutionary process of early Christian history, in its thinking about Jesus, moved not from his humanity to his deity, as critical students of the gospels during the latter part of the nineteenth century had come to believe. What really occurred, one is told, was the humanizing of a deity Jesus already worshipped by disciples, and the creation of stories about his earthly career for the purpose of making him more concrete and real, and so more significant for his followers. But this skeptical school has never been large, nor does its prestige seem likely to increase.

III

Writers upon the life of Jesus who have taken up seriously the task of carrying forward the work of historical criticism,

[6] An excellent example is the popular David Smith, *The Days of His Flesh* (8th ed., New York, 1910); or, somewhat less thorough-goingly traditional, A. E. Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus* (London, 1907). Here belongs also the more recent A. C. Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ* (Oxford, 1923).

[7] This discussion up to 1912 is summarized in S. J. Case, *The Historicity of Jesus* (Chicago, 1912); C. Guignebert, *Le Problème de Jésus* (Paris, 1914). The debate has been renewed in France by P. L. Couchoud, *Le mystère de Jésus* (Paris, 1924), whose skepticism is refuted by M. Goguel, *Jésus de Nazareth. Mythe ou Histoire* (Paris, 1925). Couchoud has been joined by the Danish literateur Georg Brandes, *Sagnet om Jesus* (Copenhagen, 1925).

in its application to the study of the life of Jesus, have performed some significant tasks during the past quarter century. Perhaps the outstanding feature of their work has been an effort to rewrite the story of Jesus' career on the basis of the nineteenth century's literary criticism of the gospels. An outstanding effort in this direction is the work of Oskar Holtzmann, which appeared in 1901.[8] He selected the Gospel of Mark as the basis for his historical reconstruction of Jesus' life and teaching, and into the Markan scheme he endeavored to weave all elements in tradition which seemed to him worthy of credence when subjected to a thorough-going process of literary criticism. The Gospel of John was set aside as practically valueless, and material that might be attested only in sections peculiar to either Matthew or Luke was used with caution. But the non-Markan sections common to Matthew and Luke (the Logia) were accepted as important supplements to Mark.

One easily distinguishes a second type of critical "Life" which shows deference more especially for the Logia, and which makes Mark secondary. Typical of this interest and very influential for subsequent work, were the lectures of Harnack published in 1900 under the title *What Is Christianity?*[9] In the section dealing with Jesus and the gospels,

[8] *Das Leben Jesu* (Tübingen, 1901), translated by J. T. Bealby and M. A. Canney, *The Life of Jesus* (New York, 1904).

[9] *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1900), translated by T. B. Saunders, *What Is Christianity?* (New York, 1901). This line of development has produced a large number of books with emphasis on the moral and spiritual leadership of Jesus depicted largely in terms of the content of the Logia representation but infused more or less with Ritschlian tendencies. Only a few representative titles of more recent date need be mentioned, e.g., W. Heitmüller, *Jesus* (Tübingen, 1913); P. Wernle, *Jesus* (Tübingen, 1916); C. Piepenbring, *Jésus Historique* (2me éd. Paris, 1922), translated by Lilian A. Clare, *The Historical Jesus* (New York, 1924); P. Chiminelli, *Gesú di Nazareth. Studio critico-storico* (2da ed. Roma, 1921); G. A. Barton, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York, 1922); E. I. Bosworth, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus* (New York, 1924).

he is discovered to have been a teacher of moral and spiritual idealism such as one meets in the Sermon on the Mount, rather than a prophet of impending judgment as pictured in the thirteenth chapter of Mark. Jesus' message about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, together with his own ideal life of sonship and brotherhood, are made central in this type of critical "Life of Jesus." Interest in recovering the historical Jesus is accompanied by a further interest in defining his significance for religion today. His worth is estimated in Ritschlian fashion, to the effect that he has the value of God for us. This is to be seen either in the moral and spiritual quality of his own person, as contemplation of him produces reverence and appreciation on the part of the disciple, or it appears in the modern human life which he lived. While the critical interest is uppermost, an apologetic strain still more or less faint, survives.

Modernism within the Catholic Church has been an interesting phenomenon of the twentieth century. Though it produced no formal "Life of Jesus"[10] its representatives concerned themselves very immediately about him and his significance. They accepted the results of literary criticism, and combined therewith a concern to preserve the religious value attaching to Christendom's memory of Jesus. They accomplished this end by distinguishing between a "Christ of faith" and a "Christ of history." The latter, they believed, was to be seen in his truest form in the Logia and the Gospel of Mark. Later evangelists, and John in particular, were more interpretative and less historical. But for religion, the supernatural Christ of faith was just as real a figure as the historical Jesus. This was the Christ according to the Spirit, who was the adequate ground of Christian faith in all ages. But

[10] A. Loisy, *Jésus et la tradition évangelique* (Paris, 1910), belongs among the "eschatologists," even though the author is a notable Catholic modernist.

into any disciple's description of the Christ of faith, when portrayed as a historical character, there might enter legendary elements due to the interpreter's fancy or to logical deductions of his own making. Thus arose a Christ of legend and a Christ of dogma. What critical literary study of the gospels gave one was the Christ of history. Had a modernist written a "Life of Christ" it would have been at least professedly and intentionally of the critical literary type.[11]

When literary criticism of the gospels was supplemented by a study of later Jewish books, a striking similarity was observed between the interest of certain Jewish writers in the hope of an early end to the present age and the teaching of Jesus relative to the inauguration of a new Kingdom of God in apocalyptic fashion. The extent to which this imagery appeared in the gospel of Mark was stressed by several writers who made it the key to a reconstruction of the history of Jesus and his teaching. This feature of Mark had already been recognized for several years, but it was brought uniquely into prominence in 1906 by Schweitzer in Germany, and was made central for a study of Jesus by Loisy in his two volumes on the *Synoptic Gospels*[12] in 1907. Among English scholars it was championed even by Professor Sanday of Oxford, whose *Life of Christ in Recent Research* also came out in the year 1907. This was the dominant interest among critical scholars in their discussions about Jesus until attention was diverted into other channels by the events of the year 1914.[13]

[11] This position is set forth in *The Programme of Modernism* translated from the Italian by G. Tyrrell (New York, 1908).

[12] A. Loisy, *Les Evangiles synoptiques*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907 f).

[13] See, for example, E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah* (Edinburgh, 1911); C. W. Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels* (Edinburgh, 1911); E. C. Dewick, *Primitive Christian Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1912); H. L. Jackson, *The Eschatology of Jesus* (London, 1913).

This emphasis upon the eschatological side of Jesus' thinking involved the necessity of special inquiries into his so-called self-consciousness. In the method of Harnack and the Ritschlian school generally, the religious experience of Jesus was modeled after the pattern of present day religious experience, where moral and spiritual ideals are the uppermost consideration. But when Jesus was transferred into a primitive Palestinian society where eschatological hopes were prominent, there was need for a new reading of his own mental processes. One now began to ask whether his temperament was normal, or whether he was an ecstatic visionary. Study of his psychology was now in order, and it became necessary to raise problems regarding his psychic health.[14]

IV

Among developments more distinctively original to the twentieth century has been a new interest in the problem of the relation between Jesus and his contemporaries. Traditional opinion even within critical circles had generally maintained that between Jesus and the religious leaders of his day there was an irreconcilable conflict in principle on the question of what constituted genuine religion. In particular, the alleged barren legalism of the Pharisees was made a kind of foil against which to set off the more spiritual and vital character of Jesus' own religion. Harnack's *What Is Christianity?* had proceeded upon this assumption, against which Jewish scholars vigorously protested. They did not so much deny to Jesus the religious quality ascribed to him by Harnack, but they resented Harnack's lack of appreciation of ancient Judaism.

[14] This literature has been critically surveyed by W. E. Bundy, *The Psychic Health of Jesus* (New York, 1922).

Jewish scholars themselves now began to take a livelier interest in Jesus. In England Montefiore led in this work,[15] in which he was later assisted by Professor Abrahams of Cambridge.[16] From outside of Judaism further support came to this line of study through the publication of Herford's interpretation of Pharisaism.[17] More recently there has appeared in Germany an extensive scholarly investigation of the whole New Testament literature in the light of Talmudic parallels, a work of fundamental significance for the investigation of Jesus in relation to his Palestinian environment.[18] Moreover, Jewish scholars themselves, working from the point of view of the latest literary critical results upon the study of the gospels, have composed sympathetic and suggestive accounts of Jesus' life and work.[19] These writers are actuated by genuinely scholarly ideals, and a high appreciation of Jesus' place in the line of Jewish religious prophets and teachers.

A new aspect of literary study affecting the gospels as sources of information for a knowledge of the life of Jesus has been opened up in recent discussions regarding the possibility of recovering an Aramaic original for one or more of

[15] C. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels,* 2 vols. (London, 1909). *Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus* (London, 1910); *The Old Testament and After* (London, 1923).

[16] I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism,* First Series (Cambridge, 1917), and Second Series (1924).

[17] R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism, Its Aim and Method* (New York, 1912), *The Pharisees* (New York, 1924).

[18] H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud and Midrash,* Vol. I: *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (München, 1922); Vol. II: *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte* (1924); cf. also P. Fiebig, *Jesu Bergpredigt* (Göttingen, 1924).

[19] Such as H. G. Enelow, *A Jewish View of Jesus* (New York, 1920); J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* translated from the original Hebrew by H. Danby (New York, 1925).

the present Greek gospels. Professor Torrey[20] in America has vigorously championed a Semitic original for large sections of the gospels. It had been common enough to think of an original Aramaic form of the Logia, but to carry this hypothesis over into Mark and even into Luke outside of the Logia sections, as Professor Torrey does, would imply a much more vigorous literary activity on the part of the early Christians previous to the rise of a Gentile Christianity than had commonly been believed. Still more recently, Professor Burney[21] of England has defended the hypothesis of an original Aramaic even for the present Greek Gospel of John, and Professor Torrey also supports this hypothesis, although disagreeing in many particulars with Professor Burney.

The two-document solution of the synoptic problem, so widely accepted during the last quarter of the nineteenth century as the last word in literary criticism of the gospels, has occasionally been called in question. Professor Burton of America published in 1904 an intensive study of the question, and proposed a four-document hypothesis.[22] Still more recently the problem has been reopened by B. H. Streeter of England, who also projects a four-document hypothesis, the elements of which are, however, quite original with him.[23] He

[20] C. C. Torrey, "The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels" in *Studies in the History of Religion* (New York, 1912), *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Cambridge, 1916), "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John" in the *Harvard Theological Review,* XVI (1923), 305–44.

[21] C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, 1922); cf. the pamphlet of J. A. Montgomery, *The Origin of the Gospel According to St. John* (Philadelphia, 1923).

[22] E. D. Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem* (Chicago, 1904).

[23] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York, 1925).

accepts Mark and the Logia, but adds two other sources of the Logia type, used independently in the one case by Matthew and in the other by Luke. Just what bearing these new lines of literary criticism might have upon a new "Life of Jesus" has not been as yet determined.

In the meantime, still another aspect of gospel criticism has newly arisen, particularly in Germany. It attempts to go beyond the results of literary criticism, in an effort to ascertain the influence which interests and activities within the Christian community had upon determining the literary form which gospel tradition finally assumed. In the present gospels these scholars find reflected not so much the literary skill of individual authors as the activities and needs of the Christian societies. The positive results of this line of study for a new biography of Jesus, have not yet been appraised, but on first sight they seem somewhat disturbing. From this point of approach one may not assume that either Mark or the Logia has been immune from the same pragmatic influences operating within the Christian communities at the time of their composition that similarly affected Matthew, Luke, and John at later periods.[24]

The exact lines of future development in the critical study of Jesus' career are not easy to forecast. Since the close of the world-war, there have been sporadic attempts to relate him in new fashion to the history of his own time. Even some scholars who formerly believed that Jewish apocalypticism gave one the key to an understanding of Jesus' thinking about himself, have now abandoned this approach and advocate the opinion that Jesus did not forecast an early end of the

[24] The most convenient guide to this school of criticism is E. Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Giessen, 1924).

social order of his own day. On the contrary it is said that he held to a more modern conception of society, by which an ideal order is to be established through the cultivation of individual piety, applicable also in national relationships.[25] Thus Jesus becomes the ideal international pacifist who would eliminate war from the experience of the human race. In a similar vein others have discovered that the true insight of Christ was so universal that he completely transcended the political passions of his own age, and represented an attitude that has now emerged for the first time since his day.

Indications are not wanting to show that study upon the life of Jesus in the near future must place much stress on the actual environment in which he himself lived, as well as on the social environment of those Christians who were responsible for giving present shape to the gospel tradition. Literary criticism must be tested by social conditions. The content of a document, as indicative of the social experiences out of which it arose, is more determinative for historical value than even a knowledge of the literary relations of the gospels to one another, or any hypothesis as to an original Aramaic back of the Greek. And any estimate of Jesus' ideas which is not vitally integrated with the conditions of his own day will hardly be able to stand the white light of a disinterested historical research. The last quarter of a century has shown, perhaps more clearly than ever before, that historical inquiry still has much to do upon the subject of the life and teaching of Jesus.

[25] This is notably true of Lily Dougall and C. W. Emmet, *The Lord of Thought* (New York, 1922). A similar interest motivated the work of Simkhovitch, mentioned above. Cf. also S. Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (London, 1916).

THE STUDY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY

I

Altogether a valuable heritage, literary and historical, was left to the student of Christian origins by the nineteenth century. On the literary side the scientific criticism of the New Testament through a hundred years had transformed it from an infallible textbook for Christian theology into the one important source book for the study of early Christian history. All of this research, lavished without stint on New Testament documents, enabled the student to make his way back to the time when there was no New Testament canon and Christianity was experiencing its vigorous initial growth. The records of this period were restored for him in approximately their original form and he learned to interpret them with the idiom and vocabulary of the authors themselves. Also, by a scientific analysis of composite documents, he could go back of the records themselves and so glimpse antecedent memoranda of Christianity's growth. In these various ways the historical student found the New Testament suited to his purpose of reconstructing the story of Christianity's beginnings.

For the history of Christianity in post-apostolic times source materials were also made available during the nineteenth century. Critical editions of original texts were issued: the corpus of Latin Fathers from Vienna and the Greek corpus from Leipzig. In the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* a measurably complete collection of translations covering the entire period

was placed at the disposal of English readers. The end of the last century was also the great period for writing the literary history of early Christianity. Harnack, Krüger, and Cruttwell published encyclopedic works that have been supplemented but not supplanted. So far as literary equipment was concerned, therefore, the historian of early Christianity could start the new century with ample materials for purposes of documentation.

From a broadly historical standpoint the great contribution of the nineteenth century to the reconstruction of primitive Christian history was its emphasis on the fact of development in the initial stages of the new movement. The idea of evolution so completely dominated philosophical thought and scientific experimentation through the last half of the nineteenth century that the student of history had to reckon with it. Investigation showed that the story of mankind lent itself readily to developmental interpretation.

Religious thinkers were very tardy in applying this idea to the history of the Christian movement. Orthodoxy, Catholic and Protestant alike, stood for a static conception of the Christian religion as a *quantum* of divine revelation. Yet a little less than a hundred years ago Cardinal Newman somewhat unwillingly admitted that the historical expression of Christianity had been humanly conditioned. Seventy-five years later the Catholic Modernists were ready to abandon their traditional conception of the Christian religion as a perfect robe that needed only to be further unfolded, and substituted for it the vital conception of a constantly expanding social organism.

On the Protestant side the Tübingen school of interpreters gave stimulus to historical study by depicting the earliest de-

velopment in Christianity as a conflict between Petrine particularism and Pauline universalism—a conflict that gradually resolved itself into the synthesis of the ancient Catholic Church. Harnack, in *Das Wesen des Christentums,* published in 1900, fairly represented the position of liberal thought in this regard at the beginning of our era. He differentiated carefully between historical and essential Christianity, and, while affirming that the latter was immutable, he pronounced historical Christianity to be a real growth, subject to constant change and development. Thus, although it is not possible to find in the preceding hundred years a consistent and thoroughgoing application of the developmental principle to early Christian history, yet even the partial utilization of this idea was sufficient to add zest to historical inquiry at the opening of our quarter-century.

II

The years around 1900 saw the production of several comprehensive and valuable histories of early Christianity by competent scholars, German, English, and American.[1] The more considerable of these have continued in use through the last twenty-five years and are still cited as standard reference books. These volumes constitute an unmistakable index to the problems which engrossed the minds of critical scholars twenty-five years ago. When put to the test they reveal two

[1] Vernon Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity* (New York, 1899); A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* (New York, 1899[2]); O. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren* (Berlin, 1902[2]), translated by W. Montgomery, *Primitive Christianity* (New York, 1906–10); C. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* (Tübingen, 1901[3]), translated by James Millar, *The Apostolic Age in the Christian Church* (New York, 1899[2]); P. Wernle, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* (Tübingen, 1900), translated by G. A. Bienemann, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (New York, 1903).

outstanding interests: the doctrinal prepossession native to Protestantism, and the literary predilection so highly developed at the end of the nineteenth century. Their emphasis is on dogma and documents.

In English no history of early Christianity has yet superseded McGiffert's *Apostolic Age*. Yet the volume throughout reveals the limitations of the literary approach. President McGiffert himself was the first to admit that his history contained much material properly belonging "within the province of special works upon New Testament literature, exegesis, or theology."[2] It is instructive to observe that a recent manual on New Testament introduction makes particular reference to the *Apostolic Age* because it "deals fully and helpfully with the books of the New Testament in relation to . . . . the development of Christian thought."[3]

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the pages of McGiffert are largely barren of consideration for the immediate social environment of early Christianity. In accounting for the origin of the Christian religion less than ten pages are devoted to Judaism, and these, for the most part, are occupied with a discussion of the utterly simple theology of the Jewish people. The life of the Graeco-Roman world is not noticed at all, save in another ten pages that serve as an introduction to Paul's missionary activity. With these slight exceptions early Christianity is treated by itself alone, as if it could be fully understood in isolation.

Of German works at the turn of the centuries Wernle's *Die Anfänge unserer Religion* may be taken as typical. Sig-

[2] *The Apostolic Age*, p. vii.

[3] E. J. Goodspeed, *The Story of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1916), p. 147. Precisely the same affirmation might be made of certain very recent histories, e.g., Scott's *The First Age of Christianity* (New York, 1926).

nificantly, the materials of these two volumes were originally delivered as lectures on New Testament theology at the University of Basel. The doctrinal coloration of the work is quite as distinct as the literary emphasis in McGiffert's history.

Wernle's conception of early Christian history was simplicity itself: a creative half-century, dominated by Jesus and Paul, during which the essence of true religion was inserted into the world of men, then an anonymous century of ecclesiastical organization, during which the pure essence of Christianity suffered decadence. The author's initial endeavor was to determine the content of essential Christianity from the gospel records of Jesus' life and teaching. While admitting that the Christian religion arose amid definite historical circumstances, Wernle insisted that these conditions were but ephemeral in character. Accordingly, he hastened to strip off the husk of mere history in order to get at the permanent substance of Christ's gospel.

In his second volume he traced the fortunes of the Christian faith during the succeeding century, when ecclesiastical organization was developed to take the place of individual leadership. He saw Christian theology as the outcome of the struggle of the church with non-Christian beliefs and practices; with Jewish ethics and apologetics and apocalyptic on the one side, and with Hellenistic mysteries and philosophy on the other. Thus Wernle gave depreciatory recognition to certain religious factors contiguous to early Christianity. According to his view, Judaism in the first century served as a part of the providential preparation of the world for the appearance of Christianity, and in the second century both Judaism and Hellenism operated to corrupt the pure stream of the original Christian gospel.

III

It was already clear at the beginning of our quarter-century that this policy of ignoring or slighting the Jewish connections of early Christianity could not be continued. When once allowance was made for development, even in the periphery of historic Christianity, then the importance of environmental relationships in determining the character of the development had to be conceded. For perfectly obvious reasons Judaism had a prior claim for consideration at this point. The simple fact that the earliest Christians were all Jews, in race and religion, who lived in Palestine and shared fully in the social experiences of their people, the further fact that the gospel was first proclaimed and probably first recorded in Aramaic, and the final fact that the earliest opponents and competitors of the Christian movement were Jews—all these considerations pointed clearly and logically to the investigation of Christianity's Jewish relationships.

In the later nineteenth century a good beginning had been made in this direction. Translations of Philo and Josephus had long been familiar; but now the Jewish religious literature of the intrabiblical period was subjected to close and critical examination. In 1900 Kautzsch published his great German translation of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and this was matched in English by the massive work of R. H. Charles in 1913. More recently Jewish scholarship has shown considerable industry in making the talmudic materials available for students of early Christianity. Admitting the inadequacy of English translations in the case of Philo, Josephus, and the Talmud, it is yet true that there are excellent critical texts and German translations of these important Jewish

sources.[4] Furthermore, it is generally recognized that a knowledge, not only of Josephus and the Apocrypha, but also of Philo and the Mishna, is essential to the student of early Christianity.

The abundant data provided by these Jewish writings have been well utilized in reconstructing the history of the Maccabean and Roman periods and providing an adequate picture of Jewish culture in New Testament times. During the first decade of our quarter-century various manuals appeared, giving evidence of a lively interest in Christianity's Jewish background.[5] This reconstruction of the immediate social milieu of Jesus and his disciples has proved to be of inestimable value for an understanding of his work and of the subsequent development of primitive Christianity in Palestine.

In particular two phases of contemporary Judaism have been much discussed during the last twenty-five years: Phar-

[4] For the intertestamental Jewish literature, see, in addition to Kautzsch and Charles, the excellent *Translations of Early Documents,* edited by Oesterley and Box and published by the London S.P.C.K. For Philo, see Cohn and Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera* (Berlin, 1896–1915); L. Cohn, *Die Werke Philos von Alexandria* (Breslau, 1909); C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus* (London, 1854–55). For Josephus, see B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera* (Berlin, 1888–95) and *The Works of Josephus translated by William Whiston,* edited by A. R. Shilletto (London, 1900–1903), or by D. S. Margoliouth (New York, 1906). On the Talmudic literature, see M. Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud* (New York, 1925[3]); L. Goldschmidt, *Der Babylonische Talmud* (Leipzig, 1906–9); Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash* (Munich, 1922–24).

[5] The following are among the more important volumes that supplement Schürer: A. Bertholet, *Die jüdische Religion* (Tübingen, 1911); W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (Berlin, 1926[3]); E. R. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests* (London, 1904); W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels* (New York, 1908); O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1906[2]); J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1914); S. Mathews, *A History of New Testament Times in Palestine* (New York, 1910[2]).

isaism and Apocalypticism. The usual Christian view has been that the Pharisees were a group of hypocritical formalists who caused later Judaism to degenerate into a sterile legalism. Christian scholarship, in general, content to gather its information from anti-Pharisaic New Testament documents or pro-Roman Josephus, has contributed little to a better understanding of this important religious party. This is amply witnessed by the works of Weber, Schürer, and Bousset. On the other hand, liberal Jewish scholars who know rabbinical literature have protested vigorously and effectively against the traditional and wholesale condemnation of the Pharisees, and have insisted on the "spiritual" character of their religion.[6] R. Travers Herford is outstanding in Christian circles for his able seconding of this viewpoint.[7] The whole discussion has led to a fairer judgment concerning the nature of Pharisaism and a greater appreciation of its vitality and importance as the standard Judaism that gave birth to Christianity.

In the study of Apocalypticism Christian scholarship has continued the great tradition established by J. Weiss and R. H. Charles in the nineties. The whole field has been worked with extraordinary care, and while the exact extent of Apocalypticism in first-century Jewish thought is not clear, yet the existence of this type of hope is fully attested, and the main varieties of messianic expectation have been defined.

[6] J. Abelson, *Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature* (New York, 1912), *Jewish Mysticism* (London, 1913); I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (Cambridge, 1917–24); Leo Baeck, *Das Wesen des Judentums* (Berlin, 1922²); C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (London, 1909), *The Old Testament and After* (London, 1923); S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism* (London, 1908), *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York, 1909).

[7] *The Pharisees* (New York, 1924).

Nor has this phase of later Judaism been investigated in a vacuum. Rather it has been compared and genetically related with similar hopes, anterior and subsequent, gentile and Christian.[8] For the reconstruction of early Christian history this investigation has proved to be of revolutionary significance. It has given rise to a distinct type of life of Jesus, based chiefly on Marcan materials, and it has pushed to the fore the question of Jesus' messianic consciousness, easily one of the prime problems before New Testament scholarship today.[9] In relation to first century Christianity as a whole, it is established that one of the chief ways in which believers evaluated the personality of Jesus was in Jewish apocalyptic coinage; and this was true of Pauline gentile Christians as well as of the primitive Jewish Christians in Palestine. At no point are the connections between early Christianity and Judaism more unmistakably immediate than on the common ground of apocalyptic expectation.

Undoubtedly real progress has been made in our generation toward a comprehensive definition of Christianity's relationship to Judaism. The traditional view, which presupposed the independence of Christianity, was met in the first decade of our century by the liberal Jewish contention that essential Christianity and essential Judaism were practically identical, and that the differentia were gentile accretions. Moriz Friedländer, in *Synagoge und Kirche* (Berlin, 1908), gave a singu-

[8] Excellent introductions to the apocalyptic literature are provided by F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London, 1914) and F. C. Porter, *The Messages of Apocalyptic Writers* (New York, 1905). For a study of Jewish Apocalypticism in its gentile and Christian relationships, see S. J. Case, *The Millennial Hope* (Chicago, 1918), where literature is cited in full.

[9] The results of recent research regarding the life of Jesus have already been summarized in this series. Accordingly, the present article studiously avoids all reference to this phase of early Christian history.

lar account of Christianity's genesis by affirming that the new religion took its rise from the *Am-ha'arets* class under the influence of Essenism. Later something approaching a deadlock developed between the eschatologists, led by Schweitzer, and the history of religion school, represented by Bousset. The former stressed Christianity's Jewish connections and restricted them chiefly to the matter of Messianism. The latter emphasized Christianity's independence of Judaism as a result of its early responsiveness to gentile influences. What is becoming clear is that Christianity's indebtedness to Judaism cannot be limited to eschatology or any other *quantum* of belief or practice, singly or in combination. The connections between the two religions were vital and extensive, and as numerous as all the different people who were Jews first, but later became Christians.[10]

IV

When the importance of Christianity's early Jewish connection was recognized it became apparent that there was another background, apart from Judaism, to which attention must be devoted in solving the problem of Christian origins. The logic of facts pointed unmistakably to an investigation of the varied and complex gentile environment, the Graeco-Roman world in which the new religion grew up after its infancy in Palestine. Indeed, the study of Christianity's Jew-

[10] Representative points of view are presented by the following authors: G. Friedländer, *Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount* (London, 1911); W. Wrede, *Paulus* (Tübingen, 1904), translated by Edward Lummis, *Paul* (Boston, 1908); A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu Forschung* (Tübingen, 1913^2), translated by W. Montgomery, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (New York, 1910); W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, 1921^2); J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1914), Vol. I; Cohen, Burkitt, *et al., Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1923).

ish relationships revealed the fact that social, political, and economic conditions even in Palestine were determined by foreign forces to an amazing degree. The very language in which the New Testament books were written also called attention to the importance of Hellenistic influences, for these earliest extant Christian documents were composed in *koine* Greek for the purpose of gentile propaganda. It was further clear that in this propaganda Christian missionaries had real competition from vigorous and varied Graeco-Roman and Graeco-oriental religions already established in public confidence and offering substantial satisfactions to their devotees. Moreover, from the mid-first-century onward the actual membership of the Christian movement was increasingly non-Jewish, and more and more made up of converts from paganism. These facts led scholars to investigate the Graeco-Roman social milieu in order to determine, if possible, the nature and extent of gentile influences in the early development of Christianity.

The discussion of these relationships did not advance far in our quarter-century before three clearly defined opinions on the subject became evident. One group of scholars tended to reiterate the views of second-century Celsus and asserted that Christianity was in no way original, but was merely a reintegration of familiar items culled from contemporary paganism.[11] To this kind of argument Eusebius and earlier Christian apologists were wont to reply that parallels between paganism and Christianity did not disprove the uniqueness

[11] P. Carus, *The Pleroma: An Essay on the Origin of Christianity* (Chicago, 1909); G. A. van Eysinga, *Voorchristelijk Christendom* (Zeist, 1918); K. Kautsky, *Der Ursprung des Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1908), English translation, *The Foundations of Christianity* (New York, 1925); S. Reinarch, *Orpheus* (Paris, 1909); T. Whittaker, *The Origins of Christianity* (London, 1909[2]).

of the latter, but did prove the providential preparation of the world for the coming of Christianity. So at the beginning of the twentieth century apologists were not lacking who found Graeco-Roman cults significant only as forerunners of the true religion which appeared, according to divine plan, "in the fulness of time."[12]

Liberal scholars, standing midway between the apologists for paganism and the apologists for Christianity, were less willing than either to admit resemblances between the new religion and its pagan predecessors. They were particularly emphatic that "essential" Christianity, defined as a quantity of religio-ethical instruction originating with Jesus, was quite free from contaminating influences. Curiously enough, liberal scholars were willing to allow for effective relationships between Christianity of the second century A.D. and classical Greece of the fifth century B.C., yet they denied all contemporary contacts. This position, assumed by Edwin Hatch in the classic Hibbert Lectures of 1888, has had strong advocates in our generation.[13]

Notwithstanding these a priori judgments, scientific students of religion have persisted in their endeavor to find out what were the religious quests within gentile society of the early Christian era. This investigation has been based broadly on a study of the leading characteristics of Graeco-Roman

[12] Writers of popular manuals on early Christian history are particularly addicted to this point of view. See S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity* (New York, 1914), and F. O. Norton, *The Rise of Christianity* (Chicago, 1924).

[13] The most substantial works that promulgate this conception are L. M. O. Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* (Paris, 1906), English translation, *The Early History of the Christian Church* (London, 1909); and A. Harnack's *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1925^2), translated by James Moffatt, *The Mission and Expansion of Early Christianity* (New York, 1908).

society itself in the first century.[14] A study of the distinctive religious interests of the day has brought to light a strange contrast. On the one hand early imperial society was well equipped to secure the satisfaction of its needs over a very wide range of human experience. With all this equipment, however, the masses of men in the first century felt distinctly and keenly the need for supernatural aid in order to establish completely safe relationships with their total environment.

For the satisfaction of material and social needs they turned characteristically to a group of ethnic survivals of great antiquity, of which Judaism is only the best known. The Olympian religion of Greece furnished the standard pagan orthodoxy of the day. Recent investigation has shown that it was not a dead, nor even an obsolete, system in the first century. Instead it enjoyed certain peculiar advantages because of its monopoly of literature and art, its influence over the play life of the people, its alliance with the economic order and the political organization of the day, and its control of large endowments and magnificent temples. Farnell's unequaled five volumes on the *Cults of Greek States* (Oxford, 1896–1907), supplemented by his 1920 Gifford Lectures on *Hero Cults* (Oxford, 1921) and Jane Harrison's brilliant *Prolegomena* and *Epilegomena* (Cambridge, 1908[2] and 1921), have added magnificently to our understanding of Greek reli-

[14] A multitude of works might be cited on Graeco-Roman background. The following must suffice: Baumgarten, Poland, and Wagner, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (Leipzig, 1913); A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1923[3]), English translation, *Light from the Ancient East* (London, 1926[3]); S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1905); W. Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero* (New York, 1909); E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (Stuttgart, 1893–1902); T. G. Tucker, *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul* (New York, 1910); P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (Tübingen, 1912[2]).

gion.[15] Other races made similar, if unequal, contributions to the religious syncretism of the imperial era. To Breasted we are indebted for an appreciation of the significance of Egyptian cults;[16] to Moulton, for a better understanding of Persian religion;[17] to Jastrow, for a knowledge of the Babylonian and Assyrian systems.[18]

In two important ways Rome herself added to the mixture of religions in her empire. The antique religion of Numa had centered in supernatural powers that had to do with the common interests of family life in a rural society. At the beginning of the Christian era, however, the *princeps*—for political reasons doubtless—associated the organization of his empire with a revival of this antique religion of the home. For the development of Roman religion and an understanding of its functional significance the two great names are Georg Wissowa and Warde Fowler.[19] Rome's other important contribu-

[15] See also J. Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece* (Aberdeen, 1909²); A. Fairbanks, *A Handbook of Greek Religion* (New York, 1910); O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1897–1906); C. H. Moore, *Religious Thought of the Greeks* (Cambridge, 1916); G. Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (New York, 1925), and a host of other titles.

[16] *The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (New York, 1912). Erman, Budge, Naville, Petrie, Steindorff, and Wiedemann are others who should be mentioned with Breasted.

[17] *Early Zoroastrianism* (London, 1913) and *Early Religious Poetry of Persia* (Cambridge, 1913). See further A. V. W. Jackson's *Religion of Ancient Persia* (New York, 1908), M. N. Dhalla's *Zoroastrian Theology* (New York, 1914), C. Bartholomae's *Zarathustra* (1924), and R. Pettazzoni's *La Religion di Zarathustra* (Rome, 1920).

[18] In addition to the works of Morris Jastrow, see P. Dhorme's *La religion assyro-babylonienne* (Paris, 1910).

[19] Consult also C. Bailey, *The Religion of Ancient Rome* (Chicago, n.d.); G. Boissier, *La religion romaine* (Paris, 1909⁷); J. B. Carter, *The Religion of Numa* (London, 1906), and *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome* (London, 1912); W. R. Halliday, *Lectures on the History of Roman Religion* (Liverpool, 1923); G. Laing, *Roman Religion* (Boston, 1926).

tion, focusing certain politico-religious tendencies from the East, was the cult of the ruler. What we are beginning to realize regarding this phenomenon is that it was no mere expression of flattery intended to gratify the vanity of an egotistical monarch. Rather it was a notable religious interpretation of social experience in that it well expressed popular appreciation for the political unity and economic stability of the empire.[20]

When all is said, however, the dominant religious interests of people in the first century were of a more personal and individualistic character. The average man felt the need for divine assistance in the ordinary activities of life, to give him success in business, to protect him from danger, and to offer him some recompense for inevitable disappointments. A distinct quest in Graeco-Roman times was for supernatural aid in warding off disease, popularly attributed to the malignant power of demons. The exorcist and magician thrived on this belief, and among the most popular cults of the time were those devoted to healing gods like Asclepius.[21]

Recent studies in the mystery religions have also revealed a quantity of personal endeavor for special privilege through attachment to some particular savior-god. In devotion to a divine lord who had suffered for them men sought an emotional uplift and a recompense for failure in the assurance of a blissful immortality hereafter. For the Greek mysteries Farnell and Harrison are again our English authorities, with Foucart and Loisy holding a similar position in France.

[20] Deissmann, Case, Fowler, Toutain, and Wissowa devote important chapters to ruler worship. See also E. Lohmeyer, *Christuskult und Kaiserkult* (Tübingen, 1919) and L. M. Sweet, *Roman Emperor Worship* (Boston, 1919).

[21] R. Caton, *The Temples and Ritual of Asclepius* (London, 1900) and Mary Hamilton, *Incubation* (London, 1906).

Macchioro, in Italy, is also deserving of particular mention.[22] Concerning the no less significant Oriental mysteries, Cumont, Frazer, Hepding, Toutain, von Baudissin, Burel, Boulage, and others furnish detailed and dependable information.[23]

In connection with individual satisfactions in religion our generation has seen an increased interest in Hellenistic philosophies and a growing appreciation of the religious significance of philosophical speculation. The scientific skepticism of the Epicurean who challenged popular superstition and advanced a naturalistic explanation of phenomena, the stern morality of the Stoic who was equally rationalistic and more religious in his view of the universe—these were the main constituents of religion for many thoughtful minds at the beginning of the Christian era. In a more or less satisfying manner they answered the demand of the individual for a knowledge of reality, a determination of the *summum bonum* in life and of the means for its realization. Arnold, Hicks, Bevan, and Murray —to mention outstanding names only—have enlarged our appreciation of these philosophical systems.[24]

A distinct demand of the first century, however, was for mystical emotionalism in religion. The majority of men were not content to rely on sense perception and rational processes for a knowledge of reality. Stoicism compromised with this

[22] V. Macchioro, *Zagreus* (Bari, 1920), *Orphica* (Naples, 1918), and *Dionysiaca* (Naples, 1918).

[23] The volumes on the mystery religions are so numerous that they cannot be listed here. In the bibliography that concludes *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, by S. Angus (New York, 1925), both modern authorities and ancient sources are cited with remarkable completeness.

[24] See also Paul Elmer More's *Hellenistic Philosophies* (Princeton, 1923).

tendency;[25] Epicureanism remained true to the scientific spirit of its founder; but both alike gradually yielded ground to various mystical systems—if eclectic conglomerates may be called systems. Neo-Pythagoreanism, neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, Hermetism, Astralism, and similar religio-philosophical movements began to flourish, commanding the allegiance of the educated as well as of the masses. Classicists and students of philosophy have joined in a conspiracy to ignore these heterogeneous combinations. To the student of religion, however, they are both interesting and important as illustrating a distinct trend of thought and experience in the early Christian era. In recent years some progress has been made toward a better understanding of them.[26]

On the whole the last twenty-five years have seen real advance in the study of early Christianity's gentile environment. Not only have the more important Graeco-Roman religions been subjected to exhaustive investigation, but also Graeco-Roman society itself has been examined and the main types of religious quest current at that time have been analyzed.

V

The twentieth century has been distinguished not only for productive research in the field of Graeco-Roman religions, but also for a sharper definition of the interrelations between

[25] Notably in the case of Posidonius. See K. Reinhardt, *Poseidonios* (Munich, 1921).

[26] From a diverse literature the following titles are selected: F. Boll, *Sphaera* (Leipzig, 1903); W. Bousset, *Die Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907); F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among Greeks and Romans* (London, 1912); A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (Leipzig, 1922[3]); H. Gressmann, *Die hellenistische Gestirnreligion* (Leipzig, 1925); E. Lehmann, *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom* (London, 1910); G. R. S. Mead, *Thrice Greatest Hermes* and *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (London, 1906); W. Scott, *Hermetica* (Oxford, 1924–26).

growing Christianity and its religious milieu. It early became clear that the problem of relationship could not be solved by the easy hypothesis that Christianity was simply a quantity of items borrowed from paganism. Whatever environmental data the Christians may have appropriated, none of it became significant to them until they had subjected it to personal reaction. Still less could the problem be solved by a blind assertion of Christianity's originality. However creative these early Christians may have been, they had to interpret their experience in the thought forms of the gentile world in order to secure the propagation of their religion. Accordingly, scholars have set themselves the task of determining, if possible, the extent to which Christianity was affected in its development by its contact with gentile religions—obviously a task of the utmost difficulty and delicacy.

A group of German scholars of the so-called *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* made this problem their own. The earliest exponents of this method were philologists, continuing the tradition of Max Müller in the field of comparative religion. Eichorn, Wünsch, Frazer, and Reitzenstein may be named as representative investigators, while Üsener's *Weinachtsfest* (1889) and Dieterich's *Abraxas* (1891), followed quickly by his *Nekyia* (1893), were typical products of the school in the late nineteenth century. Because of the limitations of the philological approach and the newness of the field of inquiry the early years of our century saw but a partial utilization of environmental data in the study of Christian origins. Nevertheless some very significant work was done. Pfleiderer, starting with the primitive Christian portrait of the "Christ of faith," analyzed the various pigments that had gone into the painting. Brückner, starting with a single pigment of pagan

origin, exhibited the peculiar coloration that it added to the Christian picturization of Christ.[27] Heitmüller investigated the magical and sacramental practices of early Christianity from a genetic standpoint, and Conybeare combined the consideration of Christology and magic and sacrament in a single suggestive volume.[28]

In the years before the Great War the question of interrelationship was also attacked from a geographical standpoint and the attempt was made to isolate the influences playing on nascent Christianity from different areas of the Roman world. Egyptian influence was traced chiefly through the medium of the baffling Hermetic literature. Reitzenstein, supported by Petrie, stood out as a strong advocate for the Egyptian character of the Hermetic literature and for its influence over Christian writings.[29] Christianity and the New Testament, along with the Old Testament and Hebrew religion, were also treated as the heirs of Babylonian Astralism.[30] Likewise, the

[27] O. Pfleiderer, *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens* (Berlin, 1903), English translation, *The Early Christian Conception of Christ* (New York, 1905); M. Brückner, *Der sterbende und aufstehende Gottheiland* (Tübingen, 1920²). Cf. more recently J. Leipoldt, *Sterbende und aufstehende Götter* (Leipzig, 1923).

[28] W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu* (Göttingen, 1903), *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1911); F. C. Conybeare, *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (London, 1909). See also M. Dibelius, *Das Abendmahl* (Leipzig, 1911), and H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1908).

[29] R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904) and F. Petrie, *Personal Religion in Egypt* (London, 1909). J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos* (Münster, 1914), argues against Egyptian provenance, and C. F. G. Heinrici, *Die Hermes-Mystik und das Neue Testament* (Leipzig, 1918), denies the influence of Hermetism on Christianity. For Egyptian influence on the birth stories of the gospels, see H. Gressmann, *Das Weinachtsevangelium* (Göttingen, 1914), and E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, 1924).

[30] P. Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur* (Strassburg, 1906), *Moses, Jesus und Paulus* (Frankfurt a. M., 1909); A. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, 1905); F. X. Kugler, *Im Bannkreis Babels* (Münster, 1910); H. Zimmern, *Zum Streit um die Christusmythe* (Berlin, 1910).

circumstance of indebtedness to Persia, direct and indirect, was clearly accentuated.[31] Even Buddhistic influence—on the Gospels particularly—was maintained by some, while others asserted that the current of influence flowed in the opposite direction.[32]

In Pauline research the utilization of environmental materials has been particularly extensive and effective. The study of Paul in relation to his gentile surroundings began rightly with an examination of cultural conditions in his native Tarsus. Sir William Ramsay, in the Dale Lectures for 1907, discussed "The Cities of St. Paul," Tarsus and the four of South Galatia, with a view to estimating their influence over his life and thought. As might be expected, primary consideration was given to geographical, climatic, and ethnological factors; but religious and broadly cultural conditions were not neglected. Quite as significant was the admirable monograph by Böhlig, devoted to a detailed investigation of the culture peculiar to Tarsus.[33] Working on the very scant supply of available data, Böhlig demonstrated that Hellenistic Tarsus, not Jerusalem or Antioch, furnishes the best groundwork for understanding the thought-world of Paul.[34]

The study of Paul's religious experience in relation to the popular gentile cults of his time has had the effect of greatly

[31] L. H. Mills, *Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia* (Chicago, 1913); L. Patterson, *Mithraism and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1921); R. Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (Bonn, 1921); G. P. Wetter, *Phos* (Leipzig, 1915).

[32] For a summary of the discussion, see Georg Faber, *Buddhistische und neutestamentliche Erzählungen* (Leipzig, 1913).

[33] H. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos* (Göttingen, 1913).

[34] Studies in Pauline vocabulary and style fully confirm this view. See particularly the works of Deissmann and also T. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen, 1905); E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1912); R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt* (Göttingen, 1910).

enriching its content for the modern student. Two related phases of Pauline religion, one neglected and the other ignored, have thus been brought out into the foreground: his outspoken mysticism on the one hand, and his clear sacramentalism on the other. We are chiefly under obligation to Deissmann for a proportionate stress on the importance of mysticism in Paul's experience, although Deissmann has little to tell us regarding the genesis of this phase of Pauline Christianity.[35] Lake was one of the earliest English scholars to bring out into relief the related sacramentarian tendency in Paul.[36] Of a piece with these elements in the apostle's religion, balancing his Jewish eschatology and forensic conception of the way of righteousness, was the basic dualism of his thought, his antithesis of flesh and spirit, his devotion to Jesus as Lord, and his radical experience of re-creation through possession by the Spirit. Such experiences grew not on Jewish soil, but they thrived in the atmosphere of Hellenistic syncretism. To explain Paul's high evaluation of these items in his religion one has to consider his rearing in a center of Hellenistic mysticism and his propaganda in competition with gentile cults. What the environmental study of Paul has given us is "a classic of mysticism"—to quote Deissmann's fine phrase —and a practical missionary all in one.

It was inevitable that the frank admission of extensive Hellenistic influences on Pauline Christianity should stimu-

[35] A. Deissmann, *Paulus, eine kultur und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze* (Tübingen, 1925^2), translated by L. R. M. Strachan, *St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History* (New York, 1926^2), *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (London, 1923); W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul* (Edinburgh, 1917); P. Gardner, *The Religious Experience of St. Paul* (New York, 1911); Tr. Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi* (Leipzig, 1919); H. Weinel, *Paulus, der Mensch und sein Werk* (Tübingen, 1915^2), translated by G. A. Bienemann, *St. Paul, the Man and His Work* (New York, 1906).

[36] K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1919^2). See also the works by Dibelius, Heitmüller, and Windisch, cited above.

late a sharp reaction. This counter-tendency found an ardent proponent in Albert Schweitzer, who, having won his laurels in *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*, now attempted to solve all Pauline problems by the same eschatological formula.[37] This overworking of the messianic idea, however, was far from convincing in the case of Paul. Carl Clemen also undertook to lay the ghost of non-Jewish influences in a comprehensive volume on *religionsgeschichtliche* interpretation and in a briefer work devoted to a discussion of the mystery religions. It is interesting to observe, however, that in a recent revision of his larger volume the author allows for somewhat more of non-Jewish influence, while in a less recent book on primitivity in the early Christian movement he calls attention to a surprising number of survivals in the New Testament.[38] In Scotland Kennedy endeavored to dismiss the view that Pauline Christianity was syncretistic by citing Jewish parallels wherever possible and explaining other phenomena by the assertion of divine inspiration or Pauline originality. From our side of the Atlantic J. Gresham Machen joined in the defense of Christianity's uniqueness and gave utterance to a vigorous counterblast obviously conceived in the interests of present-day fundamentalism.[39]

[37] A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der paulinische Forschung* (Tübingen, 1911), translated by W. Montgomery, *Paul and His Interpreters* (London, 1912).

[38] C. Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* (Giessen, 1924[2]), English translation, *Primitive Christianity in Its Non-Jewish Sources* (Edinburgh, 1912), *Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum* (Giessen, 1913), *Die Reste der primitiven Religion im älteste Christentum* (Giessen, 1916). Cf. also W. Fairweather, *Jesus and the Greeks* (Edinburgh, 1924).

[39] H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* (London, 1913); J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (New York, 1921). T. R. Glover, *Paul of Tarsus* (New York, 1925), is another defender of Pauline originality. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1925), stresses Paul's Jewish connections. Deissner, Mundle, Schmitz, Oepke, and Ubbink also seek to understand Pauline piety apart from his gentile milieu.

The last half of our quarter-century brought order out of chaos in the study of Christian origins. The findings of scholars engaged in the investigation of gentile background were summarized and the history of early Christianity itself was inclusively reinterpreted in the light of these facts. In order to interpret the "Christian Mystery" and explain how a messianic sect became a universal religion, Abbé Loisy found it necessary to make a detailed survey of the "Pagan Mysteries." Similarly, Toussaint had to analyze Hellenism in order to account for Paul.[40] Two works of proved worth as mines of information concerning gentile religions are Legge's *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity* (Cambridge, 1915) and Angus' *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* (New York, 1925). The former author attempted merely to collect and arrange the facts about Christianity's rivals and to give his readers first-hand contacts with original documents. This work was well done. Angus essayed the more ambitious task of explaining why the mysteries failed and how Christianity triumphed; but his argument was not sufficiently basic to be completely convincing.[41]

Three works of great value produced during this period comprehensively interpreted early Christian history with full allowance for environmental factors; Case's *Evolution of Early Christianity* (Chicago, 1914), Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*

[40] A. Loisy, *Les mystères paiens et le mystère chrétien* (Paris, 1921²); C. Toussaint, *L'Hellenisme et l'Apôtre Paul* (Paris, 1921). Cf. V. Macchioro, *Orfismo e Christianesimo* (Naples, 1921) and *Orfismo e Paolinismo* (Montevarchi, 1922).

[41] Glassé's *The Mysteries and Christianity* (Edinburgh, 1921) summarizes scholarly discussion regarding paganism and primitivity in relation to early Christianity up to the day of the author's death. Glover's *Progress in Religion* (London, 1922), frankly apologetic in purpose, is a fitting prolegomenon to his *Conflict of Religions*. An earlier work, recently revised and of prime importance, is Reitzenstein's *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig, 1920²).

(Göttingen, 1921²), and Weiss's *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1914–17). The first-mentioned of these significant volumes was devoted chiefly to an elucidation of the actual religious situation in the first-century gentile world and an investigation of the environmental forces that governed the growth of the new religion. Bousset's volume was notable for its clear outlining of the distinct stages in the development of early Christianity: first the primitive Palestinian stage, Jewish and messianic; next the Hellenistic community, centering in Syrian Antioch, with its cult of Jesus as *Kyrios;* then the Pauline and post-Pauline stages in which the Jewish connections were broken and Christianity became completely hellenized. The work of Johannes Weiss, left unfinished at his death but successfully completed by R. Knopf, likewise took account of the gentile environment as well as the Jewish heritage of early Christianity. Though somewhat reserved in its conclusions, *Das Urchristentum* remains an admirable monument of the religio-historical method.[42]

VI

The closing years of our quarter-century saw the emergence of a distinctly new interest and emphasis in the historical study of early Christianity. Broadly, this new point of view may be described as social. Instead of placing stress, as formerly, on the activities of outstanding Christian leaders, the emphasis has shifted to social psychology, and the endeavor is now being made to understand the actual experiences of the rank and file of folk who composed the primitive Christian movement. An inclusive interpretation of early

[42] Another recent work of great sanity is *Le Christianisme antique* (Paris, 1921) by Professor Guignebert, of the Sorbonne. In Foakes-Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1920), Vol. I, the balance inclines in favor of Judaism. Cf. E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1921–23).

Christianity is sought on the basis of the experiences of Christian groups, not only from the standpoint of the inner life of the community but also from the point of view of its functioning in the society of that day. This is no merely academic interest. Rather it is in line with the practical tendency of religionists today to emphasize the social aspect of modern Christianity. To a certain extent the present stress on the importance of social motivation accounts for the eagerness of students to view early Christian history from a similar perspective. Thus, in place of the historico-literary interest of 1900 that was concentrated on early Christian documents, and in place of the religio-historical interest of 1914 that was diffused over wide environmental areas, there has developed the socio-historical interest of 1926 that is focused on the religious living of early Christians in the social milieu of the first century.

As yet this socio-historical interest is too new to have produced an extensive literature. The teachings of Jesus regarding an ideal society have been treated in a large number of volumes, but only a very few books have been written about the social experiences of the early Christians.[43] *Kultgeschichte* and *Formgeschichte* represent limited phases of this study of primitive Christianity. G. Bertram, the chief exponent of the former method, regards nascent Christianity not as the religion of individuals but as a group religion, with its focus in a form of worship.[44] The *formgeschichtliche Methode* is de-

[43] Typical titles are: P. Allard, *Les esclaves chrétiens* (Paris, 1914[6]); U. Benigni, *Storia sociale della Chiesa* (Milan, 1906–12); C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* (Edinburgh, 1925); E. von Dobschütz, *Die urchristlichen Gemeinden* (Leipzig, 1902), translated by Georg Bremner, *Primitive Life in the Christian Church* (New York, 1904); F. Hauck, *Die Stellung des Christentums zu Arbeit und Geld* (Gütersloh, 1921); E. Lohmeyer, *Soziale Fragen im Urchristentum* (Leipzig, 1921).

[44] *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult* (Göttingen, 1922).

voted to the task of showing how social motivation operated in the formation of gospel tradition. Its thesis is that the form and content of our gospels were fixed, to a considerable degree, by group activities and interests during the preliterary period of early Christianity.[45]

In 1912 Achelis, in his *Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten,* presented a picture of Christianity's early history in terms of the growth of religious communities. Although he made allowance for environmental influence, yet the driving power in the process, as he saw it, was to be found in certain inspired individuals. A little over a decade later Professor Case, in his *Social Origins of Christianity* (Chicago, 1923), traced the development of the same movement through the same period with a reversed emphasis on the social factors involved. He portrayed the religious experiences of Christian groups and, on the basis of environmental influences mediated through its membership, he explained Christianity's transition to the gentile milieu, its consolidation into a well-organized movement, and its final triumph over vigorous rivals. As a comprehensive survey of the development of early Christianity in its gentile relationships this volume constitutes a succinct summary of the researches of the last twenty-five years. Because of its social point of view and its scientific methodology, however, it belongs rather to the quarter-century on which we are entering.

The social conception of historical processes to which the studies of the last few years have brought us leaves the student of Christian origins with a vastly enlarged task of the

[45] The results of research by this method are evaluated by E. Fascher in *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (Giessen, 1924).

utmost complexity. To unravel the tangled skein of modern society of which we are a part is difficult enough for the trained sociologist, even with his abundant source materials ready at hand. How much more difficult the task of the historian, who must reconstruct the life of human society nearly twenty centuries ago with comparatively scant sources of information to draw from. While utilizing his documents to the full he must deal ultimately not with these external data but with the on-going social process, a current in the stream of humanity's life, on the surface of which they float. To explain the facts of ancient experience he must consider the physical stimuli of habitat and climate in the Mediterranean world, and he must understand also the social stimuli of inherited customs and political crises and economic rivalries. Nor should he neglect the social mind and the will of the group as expressed in the institutional life of the community. Ideally he should know the entire range of religious experience represented by the Christian movement during the early centuries of our era.

It is a task too immense for any one scholar, or even for a group of specialists working in a single field. At the beginning of our century investigations of the religio-historical type demonstrated the need of collaboration with specialists in other religions. Now socio-historical study demonstrates the acute need of collaboration with specialists in other sciences. The student of Christian origins should not hesitate to summon to his aid the geographer, the anthropologist, the archaeologist, the philologist; while psychology, sociology, and the social sciences generally are absolutely essential for a reconstruction of social situations in the ancient world. The desired result cannot be obtained except by a synthesis of all

the sciences which provide data and conclusions significant for an understanding of early Christianity.

To recapitulate: Twenty-five years of research have transformed the historical study of the New Testament into the history of early Christianity. Today the initial development of Christianity is viewed not merely as a phase in the history of religions but as a part of the total history of mankind.

THE INTERPRETATION OF PROTESTANTISM

JOHN THOMAS McNEILL

I

The figure of Luther at Worms dramatically invoking "scripture," "reason," and "conscience" against the authority of pope and emperor, council and diet, has imprinted itself upon the consciousness of each generation in the four centuries since. There has been a tendency to treat these great words of Luther's speech as a complete index to the constituent elements of Protestantism. By orthodox Protestants they have been held to signify the authority of Scripture and the right of private judgment. Adverse critics from the Roman side have seen in Luther and in Protestantism an excess of individualism, a reliance upon one's own reason and one's own conscience as infallible; and although Luther's appeal was clearly to a group exercise of reason and to conscience informed in conference, extreme individualists and rationalists, on the strength of this and other partially interpreted utterances of Luther, have claimed him for their own. On the other hand, the appeal to Scripture has been uncoupled from the appeal to reason, and generations of bibliolaters have asserted that "the Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants."[1]

Whatever stress has been laid on one of these elements or the other, it has been widely held that the Protestant concep-

[1] William Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants,* 1637. The passage is found in the 1870 edition, p. 463. The author of this slogan had reasoned himself from Arminianism to Romanism and from Romanism to Latitudinarianism, and remained an unconscious but incurable rationalist.

tion of religion comprehends merely God, his Book, and the individual soul. Such is the fascination of simple definitions. But certain impressive facts not comprehended here could not be entirely overlooked. Protestantism, from the first, erected safeguards against both individualism and literalism. It formed national churches which declared themselves Catholic and Rome schismatic. Gibbon expresses surprise, not that the reformers rejected so much, but that they kept so much of the inherited dogma. Ranke can say of the first Protestant confession of faith that it is "a product of the living spirit of the Latin Church."[2] The reformed churches held a high doctrine of church authority, restored and developed conciliar government, and set up systems of discipline which controlled the individual. Facts of this kind have enabled historians to recognize in Protestantism a principle of continuity and solidarity, and placed its defenders on firm ground.

A still wider range of facts has been employed by many recent interpreters. Impressed by late conceptions of the operation of social causes, they view the total phenomena of the sixteenth century as one vast complex, in which Protestantism is so commingled with cultural, political, and economic factors that its religious significance is only with difficulty to be discerned. And with regard to the subsequent period, some hold that the old Protestantism has given place, under the influence of its environment, and especially of the Enlightenment, to a new Protestantism which is the religion of our progressive civilization.

"Protestantism" thus becomes a term which authorities hesitate to define. Perhaps no term in common use is more

[2] *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation,* Bd. III (1840), p. 243.

nearly impossible of definition. Both Troeltsch and Von Hügel, those friendly disputants in recent religious thought, from their different angles of approach have recognized this peculiar difficulty. "If," says Troeltsch, "we are seeking a definition of Protestantism as a whole, it cannot be immediately formulated."[3] This is because he believes that Protestantism, two centuries after its inception, suffered a sea change. Von Hügel, pointing to its "fissiparous" character, remarks that it is "well-nigh impossible" to determine "what varieties, to the right or to the left, still belong to Protestantism."[4] And if we pass from the preliminary questions of periodization and delimitation to the more central problems of interpretation and evaluation, we are confronted by wide divergences of judgment. The interpreters of Protestantism have colored it black or white or gray according to their own alignment or preference. Even when objectivity is claimed, party and personal interests and limitations of outlook have everywhere to be reckoned with.

II

The vehemence of the sixteenth-century religious controversy is reflected in the work of the historians of the time. Sleidan is almost the sole impartial witness among them. The Magdeburg centuriators are uncandid; Cochlaeus is brutal; and Pistorius, venomous. Even the talented Sarpi is animated by "one hate and only one"—the Roman See. It was the task of Bossuet to write the first respectable adverse historical treatment of Protestantism.[5] The great Gallican churchman

[3] *Protestantism and Progress,* p. 44.

[4] *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion,* p. 242.

[5] *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes,* 1688.

sincerely deplores what he regards as the fundamental principle of Protestantism, viz., variation unchecked by authority, which for him means error without restraint. He finds the movement originating in the sinful and rebellious pride of Luther.

Protestant champions replied with two diverse arguments. Philosophers like Liebnitz and Bayle approved of freedom of variation as conducing to progress in the apprehension of truth. Basnage retorted upon Rome the charge of having altered the faith, now happily restored by the reformers to its original purity.[6] These rejoinders to Bossuet represent two types of apologia against the fundamental Roman Catholic interpretation of modern history. More purely historical was the interest of the Lutheran, J. L. von Mosheim, whose Latin work[7] on the whole field of church history is marked by candor and profound learning. Of like spirit was the Scottish moderate, William Robertson, who treated the Reformation with a favor too cool to satisfy his evangelical contemporaries.[8]

The argument of writers like Basnage was taken up a century ago by G. B. Winer,[9] and that of Bossuet, by J. A. Möhler.[10] These writers based their opposing views mainly upon their studies of the doctrinal standards of the churches, and

[6] *Historie de la religion des églises réformées,* 1690.

[7] *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae, antiquioris et recentioris,* libri iv, 1726.

[8] *History of Scotland during the Reigns of Queen Mary and King James VI,* 2 vols., 1758–59; *History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V,* 3 vols., 1769.

[9] *Komparative Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchenparteien,* 1824, translated, with a valuable introduction, by the Methodist theologian, W. B. Pope (*A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of the Various Communities of Christendom,* 1873).

[10] *Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten,* 1832.

their work may be said to have given rise to the science of symbolics. Ignatz von Döllinger continued the Bossuet tradition in an acute investigation of the beginnings of the Reformation.[11] The scholarly Spaniard, J. Balmes, was the author of an attack upon Protestantism unsurpassed in effectiveness.[12] This writer followed the course of history to his own time, relentlessly presenting Protestantism as "a principle of dissolution," and adding to Bossuet's main argument a study reflecting the anti-revolutionists, De Maistre and Chateaubriand, on the relative influence of the opposing churches on civilization and morals.

With warmth of Protestant feeling, yet with a generous and irenic spirit, the converted Jew, J. A. W. Neander, wrote his *General History of the Christian Religion and Church to 1430* (1825–52), and a volume comparing Protestantism with Catholicism.[13] His spirit was imparted to his pupil, C. R. Hagenbach, who published a series of scholarly though popular studies of the chief phases of Protestant history[14] which were afterward extended into a complete history of the church.[15] Another pupil and great admirer of Neander was Philip Schaff, who gave fifty years of leadership in the promotion of church-history studies in America (1843–93). Schaff pos-

[11] *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des Lutherischen Bekenntnisses,* 3 vols., 1843–48. Döllinger lived to describe this work as "a one-sided book" (see A. Plummer, the *Continental Reformation* [1912], p. 179).

[12] *El Protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo,* 3 vols., 1848, translated 1849 *(Protestantism and Catholicity Compared).*

[13] *Katholicismus und Protestantismus,* 1863 (posthumous).

[14] *Geschichte der Reformation und des Protestantismus,* 1834–43.

[15] *Kirchengeschichte von der ältesten Zeit bis zum neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* 7 vols., 1869–72.

sessed a more systematic and organizing mind than his master, and was scarcely his inferior in insight. His works include a number that are still indispensable.[16] Though devoted to the cause of reunion, he yet felt deeply the cleavage between Roman Catholic and Protestant principles. In a chapter on "Protestantism and Romanism"[17] he contrasts the two systems point by point.

Of French historians, the Protestant, Guizot, and the romantic freethinker, Michelet, treated the era of the Reformation with distinction. No writer reached a larger public than the Genevan evangelical, J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, who idealized the reformers in thirteen eloquently written volumes[18] which were widely translated and circulated.

But with the exact and dispassionate L. von Ranke a very different type of history was to prevail. His brilliant work, the ideal and despair of succeeding historians, proved more acceptable to Protestants than to Roman Catholics.[19] Ranke saw the Reformation originating as a moral revolt, but bringing about political results of the utmost importance, especially the passing of theocratic universalism and the establishment of autonomous and sovereign states.

In England the Oxford movement directed the historians of the church largely to the patristic period. On the Reformation the Tractarians were divided. Before Newman's conver-

[16] *History of the Christian Church,* 7 vols., 1870–1910 (six volumes were published before the author's death in 1893); *The Creeds of Christendom,* 3 vols., 1877.

[17] *Creeds of Christendom,* Vol. I, chap. v, repeated in *Christ and Christianity* (1885), pp. 124 f.

[18] *Histoire de la réformation du 16e siècle,* 5 vols., 1835–53; *Histoire de la réformation en Europe aux temps de Calvin,* 8 vols., 1863–78.

[19] *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation,* 1836–38; *Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten,* 1834.

sion to Rome he refused to subscribe to the Oxford Martyrs' Memorial; but Pusey attacked rationalism without attacking the reformers. No thorough historical examination of Protestantism was put forth by members of the school. Revolting from Oxford influences under the potent inspiration of Carlyle, J. A. Froude proclaimed Romanism the great imposture of history, painted a halo around the head of Henry VIII, and praised Calvinism for its social results.[20] No English study of the Reformation has won such enduring praise as that of the Unitarian, Charles Beard.[21] Beard regards the Reformation as "the manifestation on religious grounds of that great reawakening of intellectual life in Europe which in its first phase we call the Revival of Letters." He anticipates the drift of much recent writing in his view that the spirit of the reformers, if embraced today, would cause a new reformation in religion.

Another competent historian was the American Congregationalist, G. P. Fisher, whose valuable volume on the Reformation[22] appeared before Beard's book. Fisher views the Reformation as primarily a religious movement, and quotes with approval Ullmann's statement that it was "the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as Law." He holds (with Burckhardt) that the reformers saved not only their followers, but the Roman church itself, from infidelity. These writers, Fisher and Beard, may be said to represent, with the differences imposed by the lapse of time, the posi-

[20] *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Spanish Armada,* 1856–70; *Short Studies on Great Subjects,* 1867–72.

[21] "The Reformation in Its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge," *Hibbert Lectures,* 1883. Beard's scholarly study, *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany,* 1889, was not carried beyond the year 1521.

[22] *The Reformation,* 1873.

tions taken, respectively, by Leibnitz and Basnage; and the two types of interpretation persist in some degree among twentieth-century scholars.

The Roman Catholic response to Ranke in Germany reached its full strength only about the end of the century. Among the best-known historians to come to the aid of the Roman church prior to 1900 were G. Alzog,[23] J. Janssen, and L. Pastor. The voluminous histories of the German people[24] and of the popes[25] by Janssen and Pastor constitute the ultramontane reply to Ranke. These scholars have brought to their tasks extraordinary industry and learning. Of the three mentioned, doubtless Janssen, who has worked the inexhaustible mine of social history, has added most amply to our knowledge. While his candor has been challenged, he has definitely rendered obsolete exaggerated judgments both of the corruption of the pre-Reformation church and of the benefits bestowed by the reformers.

The effect of such work was profoundly felt. It gave the Roman church a better position, and correspondingly weakened the claims of Protestantism, before the world of scholarship; and it doubtless contributed to the rising prestige of Romanism in Germany.

At the beginning of the present century Protestantism lacked confident interpreters. Even stoutly loyal Protestants like Harnack defended their Protestantism with qualifications not required by a Guizot or a d'Aubigné. The views of Ranke were, by the religious mind, always felt to be inadequate, and

[23] *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte,* 1840; ninth edition, 1872.

[24] *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 6 vols., 1876–88.

[25] *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 7 vols., 1886–1909.

now his very facts had been represented as inadequate and misleading. Protestantism was in a state of transition in regard to its outlook on its own significance, and needed new interpreters who could justify its past and show it something yet to be achieved.

III

During the past quarter-century research and interpretation have gone on apace. Writers of Protestant allegiance or sympathy, particularly on the Continent of Europe, have been stimulated by the continued aggressive attacks of Roman Catholic historians. These have been directed largely against the not invulnerable figure of Luther—a fact which is perhaps unfortunate for the progress of the study and interpretation of Protestant history as a whole. The Dominican, F. H. Denifle, with animus equal to his learning, presents Luther as a sensual man who entered hypocritically upon the monastic life, proved his unfitness for it, and left it to become a rebel and a moral degenerate.[26] Denifle's use of the sources is too obviously disingenuous, and his conclusions are too extreme, to satisfy any wide circle of readers. More damaging to Luther's fame is the totally different treatment accorded him by the Jesuit, H. Grisar.[27] Grisar weaves about the Reformer a web of abnormal psychology. The victim of unfavorable heredity and environment, he was subject to fits of fear, morbid trains of thought, inward self-torture, megalomania, hallucinations, and temptations of the flesh. Ample parallel instances from the observations of present-day psychologists are given. It naturally follows that his opinions, ideas, and courses of action are found to be a mass of confusion and error.

[26] *Luther und Lutherthum in der ersten Entwicklung*, 3 vols., 1903–9.

[27] *Luther*, 3 vols., 1911–13.

A third assault upon Luther comes from the French Roman Catholic standpoint, and is fairly represented by A. Beaudrillart.[28] In his view Luther is the embodiment of German violence and sentimentality. He further labors to show that Protestantism tends to irreligion and is not favorable to culture. "How pleased Bossuet would have been," comments a French cardinal in introducing Beaudrillart's book; but in spirit it falls below Bossuet's level.[29] These variant attacks and the undying interest in Luther have called forth numerous books by Protestant and humanistic writers. Among the leading German workers in Luther research is A. V. Müller.[30] Müller is an ex-monk, whose training in Scholastic theology and monastic history has enabled him ably to confute Denifle and to substantiate Luther's own statements on his experience as novice and monk. O. Scheel[31] has illuminated aspects of Luther's life and effectively controverted the abnormal psychology theory. K. Holl[32] and H. Böhmer have made valuable corrections of previous knowledge. In his *Luther in the Light of Recent Research,*[33] Böhmer has given an interesting book of Luther interpretation, marked on the whole by fairness and insight, though obviously a defense of the Reformer against

[28] *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism,* French ed., 1904; English, 1908.

[29] In 1915 Beaudrillart held that Germany had planned the war in order to secure the triumph of Protestantism over Catholicism (*The German War and Catholicism*).

[30] *Luthers theologische Quellen: seine Verteidigung gegen Denifle und Grisar,* 1912; *Luther und Tauler,* 1918; *Luthers Werdegang bis zum Thurmerlebnis,* 1920.

[31] *Martin Luther, vom Katholicismus zur Reformation,* 2 vols., 1917.

[32] *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* 1921.

[33] *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung,* 1906; translated, 1916.

his detractors. Similarly favorable is A. Harnack's popular study of Luther.[34]

In America Luther has been interpreted in a number of respectable biographies. From the Lutheran standpoint we have the now antiquated books of H. E. Jacobs[35] and J. W. Richard.[36] P. Smith's numerous studies, and especially his life of Luther,[37] based largely upon the correspondence, give him a high place among Luther scholars. In a preface to the second edition of this work (1914), Smith, while disapproving of Grisar's method, notes a revision of his former judgment in the light of the new psychology, and recognizes "a neurotic vein" due to heredity and early experiences. Yet Luther remains a historic personage of first importance. "Less enlightened than Erasmus, and with less of the truly evangelic spirit, he was, because more suited to his time and otherwise more effective, historically greater." And while the major crises in the Reformer's life are examined without reserve, the effect is not to belittle his greatness. Another biography written with qualified admiration but with fundamental esteem is that of A. C. McGiffert,[38] a book which admirably combines scholarship with popular interest.

The principal British writers on Luther during the period have been the Scottish professors T. M. Lindsay[39] and J. Mac-

[34] *M. Luther und die Begründung der Reformation,* 1917.

[35] *Martin Luther, 1483–1546,* 1898 ("Heroes of the Reformation Series," edited by S. M. Jackson).

[36] *Luther and the Augsburg Confession,* 1899.

[37] *Life and Letters of Martin Luther,* 1911.

[38] *Martin Luther: The Man and His Work,* 1912 (first published serially in the *Century Magazine*).

[39] *Luther and the German Reformation,* 1903; *History of the Reformation,* 2 vols., 1906–7.

Kinnon. MacKinnon's study[40] is replete with references to the sources and the recent literature. Nothing partisan could be expected from the author of *A History of Modern Liberty,* but in the central chapters of the book, Luther is a moral hero.

Of French writers on Luther, H. Strohl[41] is outstanding. While regarding Luther's boyhood as somewhat clouded with religious fear, Strohl traces the later development of his mind, as it responded at different stages to various stimuli, with admiration for the Reformer's vigor, balance, and coherence of thought. Another French Luther student is R. Will, who finds Luther a problem for religious psychology owing to the conflicting elements in his character.[42]

While the Luther question has occupied a disproportionately large place in discussion, certain writers have raised what may be called a Calvin question. Here there is no corresponding psychological and biographical problem; it is rather a question of the nature of Calvin's influence on society. It has gathered around the argument of M. Weber in a study[43] published in 1905. Weber's view is that Calvin retained an ascetic element, which, however, did not impel to world-flight, but as an *innerweltliche Askese,* an "asceticism in the world," expressed itself in the ordinary occupations, viewed as divine "callings," of men. It imparted a spirit of work and a desire for the increase, rather than the enjoyment and consequent dissipation, of worldly goods; and this spirit of work and gain,

[40] "Early Life and Religious Development to 1517," *Luther and the Reformation* (1925), Vol. I.

[41] "*L'Évolution religieuse de Luther jusqu'en 1515,* 1922; *L'Épanouissement de la pensée religieuse de Luther, 1515–20,* 1925.

[42] *La liberté chrétienne, étude sur le principe de la piété chez Luther,* 1922.

[43] "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus," *Archiv für Socialwissenschaft,* 1904–5.

at first religiously motivated, passed into capitalism, in which religion was no longer a factor. Weber's view has been adopted by Troeltsch and has called forth much discussion. It is opposed by E. Knodt in his compressed study of the significance of Calvin and Calvinism.[44] E. Doumergue, the well-known author of a voluminous work on Calvin[45] not yet complete, while he objects to the vocabulary chosen by Weber ("asceticism" and "capitalism") and strongly combats Troeltsch's general interpretation of Calvinism, substantially agrees with Weber in regard to the spirit and attitude to the world engendered by Calvin's teaching.[46]

Minor new factors have emerged in the biographical treatment of two of the other reformers. D. Hay Fleming, in articles in the *Athenaeum* and the *Bookman* in 1905, set the date of Knox's birth forward from 1505 to 1513–15, and the documentary and psychological analysis contained in A. F. Pollard's life of Cranmer[47] has gone far to revive admiration for the English reformer.

IV

It is impossible here to consider the many books which represent the admirable but pedestrian studies of the working historians of Protestantism. Only a few of such books contain passages of special value for the interpretation of Protestant history as a whole. T. M. Lindsay closes the first of his two volumes on the Reformation[48] with an extended exposition of

[44] *Die Bedeutung Calvins und des Calvinismus für die protestantische Welt,* 1910.

[45] *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps,* 5 vols., 1899–1917.

[46] "Calvin: Epigone or Creator?" in *Calvin and the Reformation,* four studies, published by the Princeton Theological Review Association, 1909.

[47] *Thomas Cranmer,* 1906.

[48] *History of the Reformation,* 2 vols., 1906–7.

the religious principles inspiring the movement. It was not, he notes, the Augsburg Confession that made the Reformation, but the expansion of a religious experience impossible to confine within a statement of doctrine. He enlarges upon the central doctrine of Luther, Justification by Faith, in the light of the Reformer's experience. The Reformation doctrine of Scripture, too, is explained in personal terms. Whereas in Roman teaching the Scriptures were law, for the reformers they were the channel of a divine life; herein lay the rediscovery of Scripture. Elsewhere in this work, with too little attention to medieval political thought, Calvin and Knox are represented as beginners of democracy.

Much fresh research characterizes P. Smith's book on *The Age of the Reformation,*[49] which concludes with a valuable summary of the interpretations of historians and philosophers. Smith's own interpretation is given more at length in a paper read before the Society of Church History,[50] where seven aspects of the movement are indicated. He moderately evaluates most of the characteristic views of recent students and ascribes to the Reformation the growth of toleration and of popular enlightenment.

The value of H. C. Vedder's book on the German Reformation[51] lies in its social emphasis and its interest in the Anabaptists, whom Vedder regards as the only true reformers of the age. Luther is not the hero; at times he is the villain of the story. J. H. Robinson, profoundly impressed by the political and economic factors in the sixteenth-century revolution,

[49] *The Age of the Reformation,* 1920.

[50] "The Reformation Historically Explained," *Papers of the American Society of Church History* (1923), Vol. VII. (The paper was read in 1917.)

[51] *The Reformation in Germany,* 1914.

and even in the teaching of Luther, sees the Reformation as the disruption of the medieval world-state, and cites H. C. Lea's judgment that its causes were largely secular.[52] The political aspects of the period are treated at large by various writers in the *Cambridge Modern History*. A composite volume edited by J. B. Paton, Sir P. W. Bunting, and A. E. Garvie contains valuable chapters on the influence of Christianity on modern society.[53]

T. C. Hall has emphasized the medieval and aristocratic elements in Calvinism.[54] R. H. Murray has studied the idea of toleration in Luther and Erasmus,[55] and political ideas from Machiavelli to Hooker.[56] J. S. Schapiro has made an objective study of the social aspects of the German Reformation,[57] and G. A. T. O'Brien has examined its economic effects.[58] J. N. Figgis, having with much learning expounded the divine right of kings[59] as a needed offset to clericalism papal and presbyterian, has added a number of studies on political and social thought.[60] W. T. Hobhouse has made a systematic historical study of the relations of the spiritual and the secular.[61] S. P.

[52] "Reformation," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1911. Cf. his article, "The Study of the Lutheran Revolt," *American Historical Review*, 1903.

[53] *Christ and Civilization*, 1910.

[54] "Was John Calvin a Reformer or a Reactionary?" *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1907; *Three Addresses Delivered by Professors in Union Theological Seminary*, 1909; *History of Ethics within Organized Christianity*, 1910.

[55] *Luther and Erasmus: Their Attitude toward Toleration*, 1920.

[56] *Political Results of the Reformation*, 1926.

[57] *Social Reform and the Reformation*, 1909.

[58] *Essay on the Economic Effects of the Reformation*, 1923.

[59] *The Divine Right of Kings*, 1896; new ed., 1914.

[60] *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius*, 1907; *Churches in the Modern State*, 1913.

[61] *The Church and the World in Idea and History*, 1910.

Cadman has more popularly treated the same subject,[62] and declared for "an elevated sense of churchmanship which forbids complicity with the state in anything inimical to Christianity." K. D. MacMillan has supplied English readers with a critical study of German Protestantism,[63] exhibiting the ill effects of the territorial system. The racial factor in the sixteenth-century revolt is emphasized by A. M. Fairbairn,[64] who sees the Renaissance and the Reformation as expressions of the Latin and the Teutonic mind. H. O. Taylor has added to his medieval studies a lively, humanistic interpretation of the great writers, including the reformers, of the sixteenth century.[65] R. M. Jones, in an original study of the detached spiritual mystics of the early Protestant period,[66] has brought to fresh notice an important phase of religious history.

A genuine advance in interpretation is made by those writers who treat the period *ca.* 1300–1600 as a unit. This division is favored by P. Smith and substantially adopted by E. Emerton.[67] J. V. Bartlett and A. J. Carlyle, in an exceptionally good developmental study of Christian history,[68] have called this period "The Great Transition," and the subsequent age, "The Modern Period." These writers recognize that Europe in the sixteenth century passed through a profound revival of religion. This revival began before Luther, and was something

[62] *Christianity and the State*, 1924.

[63] *Protestantism in Germany*, 1917.

[64] "Tendencies of European Thought in the Age of the Reformation," *Cambridge Modern History* (1903), Vol. II, chap. xix.

[65] *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols., 1920.

[66] *Spiritual Reformers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1914.

[67] *Beginnings of Modern Europe*, 1917.

[68] *Christianity in History, a Study of Religious Development*, 1917.

greater than the revolt of Northern Europe. After it men were once more devout, though often harsh and fanatical. Its value was not so much in what it did as in what it made possible.

Two notable one-volume histories of the post-Reformation period have been written by the Anglicans, S. Cheetham[69] and L. Pullan.[70] The former is a generally reliable guide to the main facts, with some defects of emphasis. The latter is less designed for completeness and is inaccurate and unconsciously sectarian, but it has unusual range of interest and vivacity of style. The popular *Outline of Christianity* (1926), edited by American scholars and employing one hundred contributors, devotes three of its five volumes to the Reformation and the subsequent period.

Valuable aid to the interpretation of Protestantism is given in A. C. McGiffert's books on modern religious thought.[71] E. C. Moore[72] and H. W. Clark[73] have contributed convenient and reliable books in this field, but O. Pfleiderer's sketch of theological history since Kant[74] is still indispensable.

V

The detailed study of the historical data has been accompanied by a continuous effort to evaluate the Reformation movement and Protestantism. A number of books of the *What Is Christianity?* type, called forth partly in response to A.

[69] *A History of the Christian Church since the Reformation,* 1907.

[70] *Religion since the Reformation,* 1923.

[71] *Protestant Thought before Kant,* 1911; *Rise of Modern Religious Ideas,* 1915.

[72] *Protestant Thought since Kant,* 1912.

[73] *Liberal Orthodoxy,* 1914.

[74] *Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and Its Progress in Great Britain since 1825,* 1890; German ed., 1891.

Harnack's famous lectures translated under that name,[75] have attempted to estimate the place of Protestantism. Harnack's book proclaims his loyalty to the Reformation as having reasserted the essentials of Christianity and brought back inwardness and individualism. Yet he regrets the losses attendant upon the formation of state churches, and the assertion of "faith alone" in such terms as to disparage good works. He points with discernment to Luther's defects of knowledge and the confusion of his thinking about the church. For Harnack the principles of the Reformation have not become obsolete; but he fears for present-day Protestantism, and reiterates his previous warning against the catholicizing of Protestantism,[76] by which he means its threatened lapse into obscurantism and ceremonialism. W. A. Brown's *Essence of Christianity*[77] contains acute criticism of the reformers and penetrating interpretation of post-Kantian thought. G. Cross has interpreted Protestantism[78] in terms of the fulfilment of personality through fellowship. For its full expression Protestantism requires to go behind its forms of doctrine to such personal experience of reality as Luther knew. But whereas older Protestantism was divisive, because it made the individual mainly recipient, the newer Protestantism is community-forming, since it makes him mainly communicative. W. P. Paterson has given a measured estimate of Protestantism as a whole, its achievements and prospects.[79] S. Mathews has combated that overemphasis on economic factors which discounts spiritual

[75] *Das Wesen des Christentums,* 1900.

[76] *Thoughts on Protestantism,* 1898.

[77] *The Essence of Christianity: A Study in the History of Definition,* 1902.

[78] *What Is Christianity?* 1918; *Christian Salvation,* 1925.

[79] *The Rule of Faith,* 1912.

and personal elements in history by a book in which the Reformation furnishes illustration of the view that the spiritual has been the dominant factor.[80]

E. Troeltsch, the foremost representative of the religio-historical school, has brought to the study of Protestantism wide knowledge of the whole field of religion. Two studies which clearly present his interpretation are his *Protestantism and Progress*[81] and his "Kulturbedeutung des Calvinismus."[82] Troeltsch sees the history of Protestantism in two distinct stages divided by the Enlightenment. If the Ritschlians saw Calvin as reactionary, Troeltsch finds Luther equally so. The reformers were essentially medieval, seeking a church-directed civilization. They even retained asceticism, though not in the form of world-flight. A "Confessional Age" intervenes between the medieval and the modern period. This was a time of conflict between three confessions, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist, in which the modern spirit was set free. Modern democratic freedom, indeed, owes much to Calvinism, but more to the outcasts from it—Rhode Island Baptists and Pennsylvania Quakers. Following the conclusions of Weber already noticed, Troeltsch affirms that capitalism is the child of Calvinism. Humanism, Anabaptism, Rationalism, as well as ecclesiastical Protestantism, have contributed to make the modern world. But the new Protestantism alone can religiously sustain it. This new Protestantism, undogmatic but Christian in its affirmation of religious inwardness and personality, forms such contacts with democracy and capitalism, with science and speculative thought, as to save humanity from the

[80] *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*, 1916.

[81] *Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*, 1906.

[82] *Internationale Wochenschrift*, 1910.

slavery of an irreligious civilization. Among those opposing Troeltsch's views, R. H. Grützmacher has contended for the unity of Protestant history,[83] while F. Loofs has related Luther with the modern age.[84]

Not far removed from Troeltsch's position is that taken earlier by the French liberal, J. Reville.[85] For Reville, however, there is a continuity in Protestant history, in which "the principles of freedom of inquiry and of the religious supremacy of the individual conscience" have always been fundamental. Protestantism was indeed prolific of creeds and confessions, but the interpretation of these always called for the exercise of reason, even by those who decried reason. Aided by historical criticism and comparative religion, liberal Protestantism has cast off the hindrances of tradition. While undogmatic and non-sacramental, it seeks not to destroy, but to revitalize the church, and claims to be a legitimate child of the Reformation. Reville has felt the influence of A. Sabatier, who is best known by a work which contains a vigorous critique of both Catholicism and Protestantism and heralds a new spiritual Christianity replacing both the rival authoritarian systems.[86] A. E. J. Rawlinson has presented authority as not antagonistic to spirit;[87] for him its function is "to testify to spiritual experience."

The Roman Catholic modernist criticism of Protestantism has differed considerably from the ultramontane, yet the dif-

[83] *Alt- und Neuprotestantismus,* 1920.

[84] *Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit,* 1907.

[85] *Le protestantisme libérale: ses origines, sa nature, sa mission,* 1903, translated in 1903 as *Liberal Christianity.*

[86] *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'ésprit* (*Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*), 1903 (posthumous).

[87] *Foundations: By Seven Oxford Men,* 1912; *Authority and Freedom,* 1924.

ference is rather in the spirit exemplified than in the conclusions reached. A. Loisy has countered the liberal Protestantism of Harnack,[88] and G. Tyrrell has disavowed Protestant influence in his Modernism. F. von Hügel is a generous opponent.[89] Protestantism, he holds, at least incidentally, brought liberation from certain abuses. But he finds "a sorry dereliction" in Lutheran and Anglican erastianism, and sees in Protestant bibliolatry a hindrance to science. He rejects Luther's black picture of the medieval church, and accuses Protestants of a doctrinaire one-sidedness in worship and an undervaluation of tradition.

Many Anglican writers disclaim the name Protestant and lightly esteem or repudiate the Reformation heritage. O. C. Quick has contrasted Catholicism and Protestantism[90] to the disadvantage of the latter, which he regards as appealing to origins against developments and seeking a faith which it may retain "in fixed and static form" in total indifference to history. Quick is tilting against the Platonist and Protestant, W. R. Inge, who, in contrasting the spirit of the ages with the spirits of the age,[91] has said that "much apparent progress is mere accumulation, false evolution"—a view which he has later expanded. Dean Inge is, however, among the most forward-looking of liberal Protestants. From that standpoint he is an acute critic of Roman Catholic modernism and of Anglo-Catholicism.[92] Seeing defects in the Reformation, he expects "a new Erasmian Reformation."[93]

[88] *L'évangile et l'église*, 1902.

[89] *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, 1922.

[90] *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity*, 1924.

[91] *The Church and the Age*, 1912.

[92] *Outspoken Essays*, 1920; *Second Series*, 1922.

[93] "The Religion of the Future," *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1924.

Most English Free Churchmen, though disposed to reunion, still give thanks for the Reformation. In this respect A. M. Fairbairn[94] and W. B. Selbie[95] have not fallen far short of R. W. Dale. But W. E. Orchard[96] and W. G. Peck[97] turn from a divisive Protestantism, with its inadequate conception of the church and of worship, to a "coming free Catholicism." (The former of these writers has lately expressed distinctly Romanizing principles,[98] and the latter has become an Anglican.) In America, N. Smyth, nearly twenty years ago, saw evidence of the replacing of Protestantism by a liberated Catholicism.[99] E. S. Ames regards the era of ascendant Protestantism as ending with the nineteenth century, and sees at hand a religious epoch beyond Protestantism, in which a religion of the spirit, or social Christianity, will prevail.[100] The Anglo-American scholar, K. Lake, has noted the failure of Protestantism hitherto to provide a supra-national society, to meet the need of sacraments, and to care for the spiritually sick. He sees fundamentalism as analogous to the decadent paganism of ancient Rome, and pictures the church of the future as promoting scientific social betterment, yet making room for mystics.[101]

[94] *Studies in Religion and Theology,* 1910.

[95] Compare, e.g., Selbie's recent booklet, *Positive Protestantism* (1926), with Dale's *Protestantism, Its Ultimate Principle* (1875).

[96] *The Outlook for Religion,* 1917.

[97] *The Coming Free Catholicism,* 1919.

[98] "Ecclesiology," *Foundations of Faith* (1926), Vol. III.

[99] *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism,* 1908.

[100] *The New Orthodoxy,* 1918.

[101] *The Religion of Yesterday and Tomorrow,* 1925.

VI

As we survey the progress of interpretation, it is clear that the "new history," with its searching analysis of social life, has enlarged the vision and the task of the ecclesiastical historian. No one will today overlook the constant pressure of secular facts on the sixteenth-century religious movement. Yet the social historians do not clarify matters when they use the word "Reformation" mainly of those cultural, economic, and political facts. To do so is to introduce a needless confusion of terms. While we habitually restrict the word "reformers" to Luther and Calvin and men of similar religious outlook and aim, why should we use the word "Reformation" to cover all the acts of a Maurice, a Somerset, or a Henry of Navarre? There is no danger that this century, with its quickened interest in religion, will fail to see the plain fact that a powerful religious movement took place in the sixteenth century; but the fact may be obscured to beginners by a perverse terminology. Are we so impoverished in language as to be unable to find other terms for the contemporary social revolutions? A similar distinction is needed in the study of the whole history of Protestantism. Protestantism, if it means anything, must mean something in the field of religion. This is not to deny the intimate relations of the Protestant's religion with his business and his politics; it is merely to maintain a scientific differentiation, and avoid misconceptions.

Nothing was more unfortunate in the history of Protestantism than its name—a nickname derived from a secondary incident in its history and never corporately adopted by its greater communions. That the thing itself was more than its uninspiring name would indicate is attested by its survival in

vigor to this day. If the name implies a mere spirit of dissent and denial of catholicity, the sooner it is abandoned, the better. But present-day tendencies in nearly all of its severed branches discredit the view that its essential principle is "a principle of dissolution," and render ridiculous the teaching of a widely used and supposedly up-to-date American college textbook on modern history, that Protestantism has, in the outworking of its own principles, passed through a process of disintegration which is now almost complete. Equally silly judgments have been made by Protestants concerning the nature and prospects of Romanism, but it should be the task of historians to correct misconceptions on both sides.

Real progress toward a positive interpretation of Protestantism can be recognized in the work of the past quarter-century. But it is all too clear to the student that no really satisfying interpretation has yet been given. Is not this because the movement itself has not yet reached fulfilment? If Protestantism has been wandering in the wilderness, it has yet perhaps a promised land to come to; and the meaning of it will be for those to declare who first set foot on the farther bank of its Jordan. Certainly attempts to interpret Protestantism should now take into consideration the reunion movement within it, which has already assumed striking importance. This movement indeed seems of itself to promise a *Neuprotestantismus,* which will be after all only the postponed realization of the sixteenth-century assertion by the reformed churches of their catholicity and their hope of ecumenical conciliar union. And amid changes in the forms of faith, which the Enlightenment and modern criticism have made inevitable, these catholic elements of polity will be seen to show the continuity of reviving Protestantism, not indeed with the

papal absolutism of the Latin church, but with the ecclesiastical ideal of a series of her great teachers—Cyprian, Jerome, Peter Lombard, and Jean Gerson, not to mention that reformed churchman born out of his time, Marsilius of Padua. Perhaps the future historian will see that the reunion movement, even more than the Enlightenment, has changed the direction of Protestantism, given expression to its long-obscured but never quite repudiated catholicity and world-mission, and revealed it as the heir, not only of primitive Christianity, but of that freer Latin Christianity which the papacy suppressed.[102]

[102] For bibliographical guidance the following may be consulted: G. B. Smith, *Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion,* 1916; G. Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformation,* 2 vols., 1915–16; J. M. Reu, *Thirty-five Years of Luther Research,* 1917; G. S. Kieffer, W. W. Rockwell, and O. H. Pankoke, *List of References on the History of the Reformation in Germany,* 1917; P. Smith, "A Decade of Luther Study," *Harvard Theological Review,* April, 1921; G. Krüger, "The Literature of Church History," *Harvard Theological Review,* January and July, 1924.

THEOLOGICAL THINKING IN AMERICA

GERALD BIRNEY SMITH

The last decade of the nineteenth century brought into consciousness a distinctly new phase of religious thinking in America. There had been for some time a growing dissatisfaction with the method commonly employed in systematic theology, and there had been sharp criticism of some of the traditional doctrines. As veteran exponents of the older theology, like Hodge and Shedd, passed away, their places had been taken by younger men who felt the stirring of a new spirit. There was much popular discussion of the "New Theology" which was being advocated by influential liberal preachers like Lyman Abbott, Washington Gladden, and David Swing, and which was receiving technical exposition by a few theologians. There was a very general dissatisfaction with the type of theology which had held almost undisputed sway in American thinking ever since Jonathan Edwards; but prior to 1890 there was no very clear conception of the reasons for this dissatisfaction, nor any thoroughgoing discussion of the task of theological reconstruction.

During the nineties American scholarship began to take seriously the work of biblical criticism which had already assumed an established place in Germany and in Great Britain. A new type of biblical scholar had arisen as a result of the application of more exact philological and historical methods to the interpretation of the Bible. It was discovered by these scholars that the use of the Bible by theologians had been marked by strong dogmatic preconceptions, and that many

biblical texts had been made to teach ecclesiastical doctrines by methods of exegesis which were inevitably discredited by more exact scholarship.

For a time the attempt was made to remedy this difficulty by giving primary attention to "biblical" theology, in contrast with the "dogmatic" theology which had prevailed. Professor Charles A. Briggs was particularly zealous for the precise formulation of biblical teachings as the only sound foundation for a theological structure. During the nineties "biblical theology" began to be emphasized in several theological seminaries. But by the beginning of the twentieth century the vogue of this new discipline was waning, and the subject itself gradually disappeared. The reason for this is evident. As soon as the Bible was studied inductively it was seen that the religious ideas of biblical writers belonged to an age far removed from ours in its way of thinking. Some of the things emphasized in the Bible had ceased to be matters of concern to modern men. On the other hand, some of the important doctrines of the church arose in post-biblical times, and hence received little or no attention in the Bible. For example, the precise nature of the three persons in the Trinity or the exact definition of the two natures of Christ could not be adequately dealt with if the theologian restricted himself to biblical material.

Moreover, biblical scholars came to be more and more interested in the task of recovering the details of an ancient culture and in reconstructing the history of that culture. The question of the relationship of biblical scholarship to systematic theology eventually ceased to concern them. The theologians were thus left to look out for themselves. Few of the younger theologians were audacious enough to pretend to the

kind of biblical scholarship which would be respected by biblical experts. The proposed reorganization of theology on a biblical basis proved to be too full of difficulties to be practicable.

There had been, during the century, certain movements of thought which seemed to promise more direct returns in the realm of religious interpretation. Of great influence was the idealistic philosophy of Hegel and some of his followers. Here was a way of arriving at a conception of God by the fascinating process of analyzing human experience. The full unfoldment of the meaning of consciousness seemed to lead the thinker into the very presence of the all-inclusive Absolute, who was readily identified with the God of Christian theology. This type of philosophy was widely influential in England and in America, as well as in the land of its birth. It was especially active in English-speaking countries toward the end of the century. The two Caird brothers, in Great Britain, and Josiah Royce, in this country, had persuasively indicated the religious possibilities of this way of thinking. Books like Samuel Harris' *God, the Creator and Lord of All* (1896), John Caird's *The Fundamental Ideas of Christianity* (1899), and Augustus H. Strong's *Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism* (1899) indicated a way of theologizing which did not depend on the complicated processes of biblical criticism, and which vitalized religious thinking by the conception of God as the ever-active immanent Power, organizing and rationalizing the universe.

The influence of this monistic philosophy has continued during the past twenty-five years; but it has recently suffered considerably in prestige owing to the advent of a type of philosophical criticism which has exposed the weaknesses of the

older Idealism. With the death of the Cairds and of Royce the chief stimulus disappeared. In America an important competitor has been the less abstract type of idealism known as Personalism, represented by Borden P. Bowne, and persuasively set forth by several of his disciples. This form of religious interpretation avoids the abstruse problems connected with the metaphysical analysis of the nature of the Absolute, but by affirming that reality is ultimately to be found in personality it is able to portray man's religious life in terms of personal companionship with the personal God, who is the immanent upholder of the cosmic order.[1]

The boundary between theology and philosophy is very vague in both types of idealism. There is a distinct tendency to interpret Christianity in terms of general spiritual culture rather than in terms of the inherited ecclesiastical system. It was partly in protest against this philosophical universalizing of Christianity that Ritschlianism arose in Germany. The theologians of the Ritschlian school attempted to preserve the traditional conception of the unique character of Christianity, and to ground theological beliefs on a definite revelation

[1]Among the important contributions, from the point of view of monistic idealism, are: George A. Gordon, *The New Epoch for Faith* (1901), and *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith* (1903); A. M. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1902); Rufus M. Jones, *Social Law in the Spiritual World* (1904); W. L. Walker, *Christian Theism and Spiritual Monism* (1906); R. J. Campbell, *The New Theology* (1907); J. Watson, *The Philosophic Basis of Religion* (1907); W. E. Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* (1912); J. Royce, *The Problem of Christianity* (1913); J. Ten Broeke, *A Constructive Basis for Theology* (1914); A. S. Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy* (1917); W. R. Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God* (1919); C. C. J. Webb, *God and Personality* (1918); H. Jones, *A Faith that Inquires* (1922).

Personalism is represented by Borden P. Bowne, *Theism* (1903); and *Personalism* (1908); H. A. Youtz, *The Enlarging Conception of God* (1914), and *The Supremacy of the Spiritual* (1924); A. C. Knudson, *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought* (1924); E. S. Brightman, *Religious Values* (1925).

rather than on general philosophical principles. Ritschlianism had a marked influence on American theologians, and was perhaps the dominant note in theological discussions during the first decade of the twentieth century. It satisfied the craving for a more direct appeal to religious experience than was provided by the older theologies; while at the same time it stoutly contended that Christianity is a religion of revelation. Ritschlianism was thus admirably suited to serve as a transition from the a priori dogmatic conception of Christianity to the more empirical and historical conception which is increasingly coming to prevail today. Christian doctrine was definitely distinguished from philosophy, and the theologian was expected to interpret and to enhance the faith of Christian men rather than to promote a general philosophy of religion.[2]

Ritschlianism brought to the front a crucial problem of present-day religious thinking. Theology has for centuries professed to set forth truths which are divinely authorized. The source of that authority has been located in the Bible. But modern biblical scholarship has been making untenable the conception of the Bible which is essential to both Catholic

[2]The way was paved in America for a favorable reception of Ritschlianism by W. N. Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology* (1898), which frankly based theology on Christian experience, and anchored that experience to Christ. There is no evidence that Dr. Clarke was influenced by Ritschlianism, but his general attitude toward theology was not dissimilar. This is especially evident in his *The Use of the Scriptures in Theology* (1906), where he advocated a definitely Christocentric point of view. English translations of Sabatier, *Outline of a Philosophy of Religion* (1897), and of Lobstein, *Introduction to Protestant Dogmatics* (1902), as well as the marked publicity given to Harnack's lectures on the Nature of Christianity gave glimpses of a theological point of view which seemed both to preserve the orthodox ideal of a religion resting on revelation and the modern scientific ideal of building up conclusions on the basis of empirical observation.

Among the interpretations showing Ritschlian influences are: H. C. King, *Reconstruction in Theology* (1900), and *Theology and the Social Consciousness* (1902); G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion* (1906); W. A. Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline* (1906).

and orthodox Protestant theology. Prior to the advent of that scholarship, scientific study and theological construction could go hand in hand. Modern scholars, however, seem to be pursuing paths of research without regard to the consequences for theology. A serious crisis is thus created. It would be fatal to the intellectual prestige of Christian thinking if it refused to follow the scholarly experts in the interpretation of the Bible; but if theology follows them it will be compelled to abandon the traditional appeal to authority.

It is this crisis which has occasioned the current controversy between fundamentalists and modernists. The fundamentalists are concerned to retain the older conception of authority in order to maintain the older religious experience of absolute assurance. The modernists are convinced that the older conception is untenable in the light of the facts, and are seeking to find a new method for theology.

The modernist controversy gained publicity first in the Roman Catholic church. The method of Catholicism in settling the controversy is instructive. Pope Pius X saw clearly that authority is not authority at all unless it is obeyed. The modernists in the Catholic church who were attempting to apply the methods of historical criticism were required either to conform to what the church teaches or else to leave the church. The organization of Catholicism made possible the successful exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, and Catholic theology has been officially guided to the anti-modernist position.

The fundamentalists in Protestantism have precisely the same feeling concerning authority. But they suffer the disadvantage of having no authoritative ecclesiastical organization. They cannot straightway excommunicate those who do not

obey dogmatic pronouncements. They can, however, go through all the motions except those of excommunication; and they are endeavoring in some national denominational bodies to enact actual excommunication. They measure all theological utterances by the standards which they declare to be authoritative, and they denounce as destroyers of the faith all who depart from these standards. But since in all Protestant bodies, as at present organized, the modernists have as primary rights as the fundamentalists, it proves to be impossible to unify faith by dogmatic decrees. Whether eventually the actual line of theological cleavage will find expression in a new ecclesiastical alignment is not yet clear. At present virtually every Protestant denomination includes both fundamentalists and modernists in varying proportions.[8]

It was perhaps inevitable that those who followed the lead of biblical scholarship should be more or less at a loss as to what should be said in the place of the older doctrine of authority. The time-honored attitude of loyalty to the Bible, together with the declaration of fundamentalists that modernism means "rejecting" the Bible, has usually led liberal theologians to try to show that modern theology is somehow scriptural. Their statements on this point, however, are likely

[8]The modernist movement in Catholicism found classic expression in two documents: Pope Pius X's famous encyclical against modernism, *Pascendi Gregis* (1907), and *The Programme of Modernism* (1908), by anonymous authors, replying to the pope's arguments. In American Protestantism the conservative position was set forth in a series of pamphlets entitled *The Fundamentals,* and has been promoted by the writings of men connected with the Bible Schools of Chicago, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles. Influential fundamentalist books are: W. J. Bryan, *In His Image* (1922); and J. G. Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923). The writings of James M. Gray, R. A. Torrey, W. B. Riley, and L. S. Keyser and others are widely read. On the modernist side mention should be made of Shailer Mathews, *The Faith of Modernism* (1924); H. E. Fosdick, *Christianity and Progress* (1922); L. Parks, *What Is Modernism?* (1924); W. P. Merrill, *Liberal Christianity* (1925).

to be rather vague. It is questionable whether much is gained in preserving the word "infallible" by stating that it means that when the Bible is "read humbly, reverently, prayerfully, and in the spirit of Christ" it "will infallibly lead the individual and the church into that knowledge of the truth which they need to know."[4] Such reading of the Bible is quite as likely to produce sentimental satisfaction with private notions as it is to stimulate accurate discrimination of the truth. As a matter of fact, biblical scholars have largely ceased to concern themselves about the Bible as such. They are interested in recovering the ancient religious life, of which the Bible is a partial interpretation. The all-important matter is to understand how religion functions in human life, rather than to canonize a literature. The primary object of theological study today is confessedly *religion* rather than biblical texts. One service which the fundamentalists are rendering by their definite insistence on scriptural authority is to show the vagueness and impotence of some of the liberal attempts to use the old phraseology while robbing it of its natural meaning.[5]

[4]W. A. Brown, *Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel,* p. 84.

[5]W. N. Clarke (*The Use of the Scriptures in Theology,* 1906) insisted that the norm of Christian theology is Christ's view of truth; and this must be learned by actual discipleship to Christ rather than by citing texts. A. Sabatier (*Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit,* 1903) ruthlessly showed, by careful historical evidence, that the doctrine of infallibility, either of the church or of the Bible, is untenable, and indicated a way in which theology might interpret actual living religious convictions. G. B. Foster (*The Finality of the Christian Religion,* 1906) showed the arbitrary character of any appeal to mere authority. H. H. Lecky (*Authority in Religion,* 1909) would substitute a spiritual authority for the technical authority of tradition. Shailer Mathews (*The Gospel and the Modern Man,* 1910) attempted to distinguish between the facts of New Testament religion and the interpretation of those facts, suggesting that modern men can build on the same facts, but are at liberty to use modern interpretations. A group of "modern-positive" theologians have attempted to rescue the conception of definite revelation by declaring that the Bible is the record of *Heilsgeschichte,* and that the definite revelation of God

The older conception of theological authority was closely bound up with the doctrine of the supernatural. The authority of the Bible was alleged to lie in the fact that it was supernaturally produced. The standard proofs of this supernatural origin were the miracles, which were declared to attest the message; and the fulfilment of prophecy, which proved the supernatural knowledge of the prophets. The conception of the supernatural has encountered grave difficulties in the face of growing scientific and historical knowledge. The tenet of the uniformity of nature, on which science is based, leads men to be sceptical concerning a report of events for which no observable analogy can be found. This scientific spirit has led to one of the most interesting developments in apologetics. Formerly the significance of a miracle was found in the fact that it was so unique an event that no natural cause was adequate to produce it. Today those who defend miracles are likely to make the miracle plausible by finding some analogy in the natural order. Said Dr. A. H. Strong: "In the New Testament Christ took water to make wine, and took the five loaves to make bread, just as in ten thousand vineyards today he is turning the moisture of the earth into the juice of the grape, and in ten thousand fields is turning carbon into corn."[6] It is more or less clearly seen that a vital religious faith must find expression in the world in which modern men must live.

---

may be discerned behind the mere historical record. So H. E. Weber (*Historisch-kritische Schriftforschung und Bibelglaube,* 1914). P. T. Forsyth (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* 1907) vigorously protested against pure empiricism, and located revelation in the "deed" of God wrought through the crucifixion of Christ. H. E. Fosdick (*The Modern Use of the Bible,* 1924) distinguishes between the "abiding experiences" of religion and the "changing categories" of interpretation, but makes Christ rather than the Bible the foundation of faith.

[6] *Systematic Theology,* I, 119.

To rest religion on events which cannot be repeated means to isolate it from the daily experience of men today. There is thus a strong desire to correlate the religious views of the Bible with what we regard as the true interpretation of the way in which God works in nature. This apologetic attitude, however, means that those biblical miracles which are totally unlike anything which we may observe today come to be "problems." With increasing frankness it is coming to be acknowledged that these problematical miracles may possibly belong to the realm of legend rather than of verifiable fact. From the historical point of view it is found that miracles are not peculiar to the Bible or to Christian history. They abound in literatures of all races at a given stage of culture. We make up our minds as to the veracity of these non-biblical stories without any a priori feeling that they ought to be defended. Our conclusions in regard to these narratives inevitably affect our judgment concerning similar narratives in the Bible. If a theologian undertakes to do justice to modern religious experience, he faces the fact that we do not experience miracles today. It would make almost no difference in the content of much modern theology if the whole problem of the miraculous were ignored. The question persists largely because it was so prominent in the older dogmatics.[7]

[7]H. C. King (*Reconstruction in Theology,* 1900) attempts to integrate miracles into the nature-order which we know. W. N. Clarke (*The Christian Doctrine of God,* 1909) leaves the reality of miracles an open question. George A. Gordon (*Religion and Miracle,* 1909) argues vigorously against basing faith on miracle. J. Wendland (*Der Wunderglaube im Christentum,* 1910; Engl. trans. 1911, *Christianity and Miracle)* is less concerned with specific miracles than with a conception of God which shall not make him helplessly dependent on the order of nature. A similar position is taken by W. A. Brown in "The Permanent Significance of Miracle for Religion," *Harvard Theological Review,* July, 1914. D. C. Macintosh (*Theology as an Empirical Science,* 1919) frankly insists that we must not play fast and loose with what science tells us about the way in which physical events occur.

The philosophical equivalent of the theological notion of the supernatural is the conception of absoluteness or finality. To show that Christianity is the "absolute" religion endows it with a kind of authority, and enables believers to maintain the same kind of assurance as that engendered by the doctrine that Christianity rests on God's Word. The conception of absoluteness, however, has met with serious difficulties in the light of our psychological and historical knowledge of the conditions of human thinking. The question as to the absoluteness of Christianity was brought acutely to the front by Troeltsch's keenly critical discussion, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte* (1901). He made it clear that any definite historical form of Christianity is conditioned by social factors. Absoluteness can be affirmed only of an *ideal* Christianity, which has never found concrete expression in any actual historical form. If we consult history rather than imaginary ideals, we are compelled to recognize the relative nature of all forms of religion. We can indeed say that Christianity surpasses other religions in its content; but we must recognize that there are many aspects of historical Christianity which are capable of improvement. It seems probable that growing historical knowledge of what Christianity actually has been, together with the growing recognition of the inevitable relativity of all human experience, will make discussions concerning the absoluteness of Christianity seem academic and barren. The only Christianity which we know is a historical movement in which fallible human beings, meeting definite geographical, political, and cultural conditions, think out the best program possible under the circumstances. As conditions change, the activities, organizations, and doctrines of Christians change. There are, of course, cer-

tain persistant human impulses and needs, and there is always a deposit of tradition to be used in so far as it is valuable; but these hardly constitute the elements for an imposing doctrine of absoluteness.[8]

As a result of the discussions concerning authority, supernaturalism, and absoluteness, the cleavage between theological parties is becoming more and more pronounced. On the one hand is the determined effort to stem the tide of historical and critical interpretation, and to recall Christianity to its former position of absolute certainty resting on divine establishment. On the other hand is a growing disinclination to spend time on ideas which seem inevitably to bring one into conflict with historical facts. Fundamentalists are insisting that the ancient attitude toward authority and the supernatural is essential to Christian faith. Modernists are increasingly attempting to understand the Christian movement in terms of social evolution.

As a result of the growing complexity of biblical scholarship and the increasing difficulty of establishing a satisfactory conception of authority, all except fundamentalist theologians have very generally turned to Christian experience as the im-

[8]Troeltsch's discussion called out an extensive literature. G. B. Foster (*The Finality of the Christian Religion,* 1906) undertook an extensive investigation of the problem. Hunzinger (*Probleme und Aufgaben der gegenwärtigen systematische Theologie,* 1909) insists that the conception of absoluteness must be retained, but shows the difficulty of doing it in any concrete fashion. G. B. Smith (*Social Idealism and the changing Theology,* 1913, and *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion,* 1916) indicates the kind of assurance which grows out of the recognition that Christianity is always conditioned by its historical setting. E. W. Lyman (*Theology and Human Problems,* 1910) furnishes an unusually suggestive analysis of the differing attitudes toward Christianity. L. Ihmels (*Die christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit,* 1914) tries to show that the quality of Christian experience implies the absoluteness of Christianity. George Cross (*Creative Christianity,* 1922) argues that the reality of Christianity is found in the experience of Christians as truly as in the objects of their devotion.

mediate source of theological convictions. When, however, experience is made the test, it is soon discovered that there are some doctrines which have been maintained in systems of theology simply through the momentum of tradition. Such doctrines are theological puzzles to be somehow solved, rather than expressions of living faith. The last quarter-century has seen the rather rapid disappearance of some questions which are almost entirely speculative for modern men, whatever they may have been for men of former centuries. For example, there is an almost complete abandonment of attempts to set forth in detail a doctrine of angels. Modern religious experience does not furnish any data on this subject. The eschatological section of theology, which used to be entitled "Last Things," now appears under the more modest title, "The Christian Hope." Less and less interest is displayed in the metaphysical questions connected with the doctrine of the Trinity or the relationship of the two natures in the person of Christ. The conception of sin has been profoundly affected by the modern interest in social problems, and is rapidly losing its metaphysical content. The doctrine of election has almost completely disappeared from popular religious thought, and occupies a very minor place in most theological systems. There is a distinct tendency to reduce the content of theology. Textbooks are growing smaller as scholastic discussions are omitted.

One of the crucial questions of the past twenty-five years has been the definition of the nature and work of Christ. Largely under the influence of Ritschlianism, Christ, rather than the Bible, has come to be the norm of theology. Two influences have combined to make the re-examination of Christology an imperative matter. Our ethical judgments are re-

flecting the modern ideal of the juvenile court, which seeks to reinstate offenders in good standing, rather than the old-time conception of regarding wrongdoers as outcasts to be punished. Conceptions of salvation which lay stress on the need for "satisfying" God's justice by rendering some equivalent for the legal penalty thus fail to evoke any experimental verification in the minds of those who think in terms of our best social endeavors. Added to this difficulty is the outcome of historical investigations into the life of Jesus. The Christ of traditional theology is no longer identified with the Jesus of history. Christologies and theories of salvation are seen to be to a large extent reflections of the religious notions of theologians. One who recognizes this feels released from any obligation to reproduce these theories. There is a widespread discrediting of the very vocabulary of the traditional Christology, on the ground that speculation concerning a metaphysical "nature" furnishes no aid in discovering precisely what kind of a person Jesus of Nazareth was.

The somewhat sudden release of religious thinking from the traditional conceptions has resulted in a period of experimental attempts at reformulation of the value of Jesus to Christian faith. The significant thing about these attempts is that the appeal is made to verifiable experience rather than to mere proof-texts. Even those who defend the orthodox Christology are concerned to show that this Christology is based on a genuine experience of the early disciples, and can be verified in the experience of Christians today. There is thus a strong trend toward a definition of the significance of Jesus in terms of his earthly life. Jesus is generally spoken of as the revealer of God's attitude toward men; but this revelation is grounded in Jesus' own experienced relationship with

God. Increasing emphasis is being laid on Jesus' own personal religious experience. Men are to be saved by responding to Jesus' inner life and by sharing, in so far as they can, the faith of Jesus. Jesus is thought of as the foremost citizen in the Kingdom of God, who initiates his followers into the life demanded by the Kingdom. His divinity is found in the spiritual quality of his life in fellowship with God, rather than in a metaphysical "nature." Christianity is conceived as "Jesus' way of living," and the Christian's relationship to Jesus is defined in accordance with this conception.[9]

One of the most persistent and pervasive influences making for changed religious conceptions has been the evolutionary hypothesis. This interpretation displaced the older picture of finished creations by a theory of long and gradual development. The evolutionary hypothesis seemed at first to be substituting natural origins for divine initiation, and thus

[9]Suggestive attempts to give vital religious meaning to the traditional Christology are A. M. Fairbairn, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1901); J. Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1909); P. T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Christ* (1909); H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* (1912); W. Temple, *Christ the Truth* (1924). The logical process underlying the formation of any Christology was set forth by G. B. Smith, "The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History," *American Journal of Theology,* October, 1914. Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (1910) gives an interesting example of the power of newer considerations in the mind of one whose training was conservative. Books like Bousset, *Jesus* (1904); F. L. Anderson, *The Man of Nazareth* (1915); T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History* (1917) illustrate the characteristic modern desire to become directly acquainted with Jesus.

Attempts to continue using the framework of the traditional doctrine of atonement are found in J. Denney, *The Death of Christ* (1902), and *The Atonement and the Modern Mind* (1903). The conception of salvation is correlated with modern ideals of social justice and moral restoration by G. B. Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation* (1905); C. A. Dinsmore, *Atonement in Literature and Life* (1906); Burton, Smith, and Smith, *Biblical Ideas of Atonement* (1909); W. Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1917); W. C. Graham, *The Meaning of the Cross* (1923); George Cross, *Christian Salvation* (1925).

to undermine the foundations of religious faith. The sharpest battle between the older static conception of reality and the newer developmental theory took place in the sixties and seventies. During the eighties men like Henry Drummond showed the way toward a positive use of biological conceptions in the service of religious faith, and in 1898 Lyman Abbott published a book which has had a large circulation, entitled *The Theology of an Evolutionist*. For the most part theologians at the opening of the century accepted the truth of the evolutionary conception, without, however, employing it in any radical fashion. The usual argument was that it is a matter of minor importance whether God chose to create instantaneously or by a long and gradual process. Idealistic constructions of the evolutionary process were in vogue, suggesting that the long cosmic process was a majestic preparation for the ultimate of evolution—man. Christ was sometimes depicted as the divinely provided initiator of a higher stage in evolution. He could thus be construed primarily in terms of his superhuman character, and the essentials of the familiar Christology could be retained. Evolution was defined religiously as "God's method of working"; but this method was treated as purely incidental. The conception of God remained essentially unchanged, and the interpretation of God's activity was pictured in terms derived from pre-evolutionary theology rather than from an intimate acquaintance with what scientists were saying. At the same time an attitude of friendliness toward science was established, and it was generally taken for granted that the "warfare between science and theology" was practically over.

The past decade, however, has seen the organization of a determined opposition to the evolutionary hypothesis. This

has been partly a reaction against the growing boldness of science as its complete release from ecclesiastical control has come to be realized. Science has more and more come to be a word to conjure with, and there has been a definite tendency on the part of some scientists to feel and to show contempt for minds which do not work according to scientific canons. Occasionally teachers of science have taken a brutal delight in shocking students who still have a conventional theology. Serious treatises, written with entire scientific candor, have set forth a philosophy of the universe and of human life which completely discards Christian ideas. While the majority of Christian thinkers have been willing to consider and to weigh the newer ideas, a considerable number of determined representatives of orthodoxy have attempted to call a halt, and to require Christians to repudiate the doctrine of evolution. Efforts have been made to secure legislation forbidding the teaching of the evolutionary hypothesis. This activity has led to a great public interest in the relations between science and religion, and numerous publications dealing with the question are appearing.

It is beginning to be evident that modern science is creating a type of culture which stands on its own feet, asking and needing no support from religion. The task of discovering the facts and formulating conclusions is accomplished by the use of carefully perfected scientific technique. This technique can be used in the furtherance of enterprises for the betterment of humanity, and is thus welcome to all who want a richer life. In the face of this self-sufficient type of scientific culture, religion has a new and difficult task. The time-honored appeal to authority means nothing to a mind which is accustomed to the empirical method of ascertaining facts. The exponents of

religion, therefore, are being compelled to ask why religion is an essential of human life. More than this, they must ask why it is an essential of human life in this modern scientific age. The challenge is a wholesome one to theology; and it will doubtless bring about a more accurate analysis of the problems of theology.[10]

The psychological and historical study of religion is bringing to the front a re-examination of the doctrine of God. In the older theology the entire content of religion was derived from God. He created the world; he established religion; he communicated truth through revelation; he determined what doctrines should be held in his church; he saved men by the exercise of divine grace. But modern investigations trace both the physical universe and the development of human institutions to natural processes of evolution. Religion is found to have its origins and its *raison d'être* in the exigencies of human life. Suddenly God ceases to be a principle of explanation. The existence of God then becomes necessary only for religious experience. Professor James, toward the end of the first decade of the century, made an application of his radical empiricism to the conception of God. Repudiating, as he did,

[10] A. D. White's *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896) was an effective exposure of the unfortunate consequences of an attempted theological control of science. A sympathetic attitude toward science is maintained by N. Smyth, *Through Science to Faith* (1902); W. R. North, *Christian Faith in an Age of Science* (1903); J. Y. Simpson, *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature* (1913); R. Otto, *Naturalism and Religion* (1906; Engl. trans., 1907); C. A. Dinsmore, *Christian Certitude in an Age of Science* (1922); J. A. Thomson, *Religion and Science* (1925); Shailer Mathews, *The Contributions of Science to Religion* (1924).

The relationship of the conception of evolution to religious faith has recently received much attention. Mention may be made of J. Y. Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality* (1922); E. E. Unwin, *Religion and Biology* (1922); M. Dawson, *Nineteenth-Century Evolution and After* (1923); J. M. and M. C. Coulter, *Where Evolution and Religion Meet* (1924).

the idea of the Absolute, he was led to ask what place God has in actual human experience. He suggested that if we stick to the facts and do not indulge in empty speculations, we find that God occupies a place along with other realities in our experience. In other words, God is a finite being in a pluralistic universe.

Another stimulating challenge came from the philosophy of Bergson, who attempted to interpret reality on the basis of biological study rather than from the point of view of the epistemologist. He found that the evolutionary process is to a large extent tentative, experimental, unfinished. The facts do not seem to warrant the belief that the entire course of evolution is predetermined by a divine purpose. If this be true, what becomes of the conception of God?

More recently sociology and social psychology have undertaken to investigate the realm and function of religion. They seem to account for all religious ideals in terms of human need, and they are prone to appeal to the development of human technique, rather than to the action of a superhuman being, as the means of human salvation.

Thus theology is suddenly confronted with the necessity of studying anew the conception of God, and of discovering, in an age which demands definite tests, exactly what God accomplishes. To a large extent, theological discussions still reflect the apologetic feeling that somehow the traditional conception of God must be retained. But it is coming to be seen that this conception includes many speculative elements derived from a philosophy which the modern world has outgrown. With increasing seriousness theologians are engaging in a new exploration of religious experience in order to determine more precisely what is the meaning and the function of

the idea of God in human experience. The doctrine of God has in the past been elaborated in relation to a philosophically construed universe. The present demand is for a doctrine which shall be related to the scientifically construed universe. The categories of political sovereignty, or of philosophical idealism, do not lend themselves to this new interpretation. It would seem that there is an interesting new field of theological investigation and interpretation ahead of us in the immediate future.[11]

The most evident results of twenty-five years of theological thinking in this country are the progressive development of a liberal movement which is committed to the use of scientific and historical method in the study of Christianity, and a sharp reaction against this tendency. The leaders of this reactionary movement are endeavoring to enforce conformity to the authoritative method, and are laying primary stress on the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible and on the essen-

[11]E. W. Lyman (*Theology and Human Problems,* 1910) suggestively indicated three different pathways by which a definition of God is attempted. W. E. Hocking (*The Meaning of God in Human Experience,* 1912) turned to mysticism and worship rather than to speculation as the realm in which the answer to the question is to be found. J. Royce (*The Problem of Christianity,* 1913) found God to be the spirit of the beloved community. E. S. Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience* (1910), and in various articles in periodicals, regards God as the spirit of a human group, symbolizing the ideals of the group. A. S. Pringle-Pattison *(The Idea of God in the Light of recent Philosophy,* 1917) makes suggestive use of the biological conception of organism and environment to arrive at something like the God of monistic idealism. E. W. Lyman (*The Experience of God in Modern Life,* 1918) emphasizes the conception of co-operation in moral endeavor, and defines God as the eternal Good Will which makes such endeavor justifiable. W. R. Sorley (*Moral Values and the Idea of God,* 1919) likewise appeals to the belief in moral achievement as the basis of belief in God. An unusually suggestive beginning of an empirical study of the objects of religious worship has been made by R. Otto (*Das Heilige,* 1917; Engl. trans., *The Idea of the Holy,* 1923). C. A. Beckwith (*The Idea of God,* 1922) surveys the theological attempts which have been made, and suggests an empirical experience of fellowship with purposive good will.

tially supernatural character of Christianity. The liberal movement is being compelled to face more critically the question as to the nature of religion and as to the way in which theology is related to religious experience. While many interesting changes in doctrine have occurred, it would seem that even more interesting developments are ahead.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION IN AMERICA

EDWARD L. SCHAUB

I

The dawn of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of a new approach to the study of religion. Thitherto investigations had been restricted almost exclusively to historical, comparative, and philosophical inquiries, employing, on occasion, philological and exegetical methods and the tools of a philosophical psychology. These inquiries, however, were now supplemented—and, indeed, in the course of a very short time, themselves vitally enriched—by psychological investigations along strictly empirical and scientific lines. This proved to be a fact of no little moment. During the past two and one-half decades the changes alike in theology and in practical religious objectives, including all phases of religious training and education, have been both far-reaching and fundamental. As a result, though in part also a cause, we find essential modifications in the curriculums and pedagogical procedure of theological seminaries and other institutions concerned with the interpretation of religion. Among the more potent of the distinctly theoretical factors underlying all these changes has unquestionably been the psychology of religion. To it may therefore be traced much of what is most distinctive in the religious thought, as well as most fruitful and promising in the religious aspiration and procedure, of the past generation.[1] So recent has been its emergence that a review of the past quar-

[1] An examination of such recent bulletins of theological institutions and of colleges and universities as are available in libraries and administrative offices on our

ter-century all but covers the span of its life; yet so significant have been its results, for both theory and practice, that any serious and measurably comprehensive account of contemporary theology must give to it specific and somewhat detailed consideration.

When concerned with the psychology of religion one may tell a fairly continuous story even though confining one's self

---

campus discloses the following facts: Of 51 theological institutions, of various denominations and faiths, and in different sections of America, 36 give especial attention to the psychology of religion, listing a total of 48 courses in the field. Of 252 colleges and universities—church (Catholic as well as Protestant), state, and independently endowed—in all parts of our country, 111 announce work in the philosophy or psychology of religion, the total number of regular courses, exclusive of occasional seminars, being 146. Of the 111 institutions, 57 offer work in the psychology of religion. In 6 cases, involving 6 courses, this occurs in combination with the philosophy of religion; in 51 cases, involving 51 courses, these are devoted exclusively to religious psychology. It thus appears that 89 out of the total of 146 courses are designated as philosophical. That even in these cases, however, psychological problems receive considerable emphasis may not unreasonably be conjectured, both from the nature of present religious issues and from the character of such widely used books as Hoeffding's *The Philosophy of Religion* (English translation, 1906) and Galloway's volume with the same title (1914), or, to refer to two American works, Durant Drake's *Problems of Religion* (1916) and W. K. Wright's *A Student's Philosophy of Religion* (1922), all of which incorporate extensive psychological sections. Undoubtedly much that falls within the scope of the psychology of religion is included also in numerous courses, bearing different captions, connected with religious education and theology, not to mention distinct provinces within psychology itself.

General treatises, as well as the journalistic literature, in the fields of psychology (especially social psychology) and sociology seem to be giving increased attention to the psychological problems presented by religion. Since 1904, though more particularly beginning with its issue of June 15, 1909, the *Psychological Bulletin* has carried accounts and critical reviews of current publications in the psychology of religion. The various theological publications have likewise been including more in the way of essentially psychological discussion. On the other hand, the pioneering journal established by G. Stanley Hall in 1904 under the title *American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education* appeared in only four volumes from May, 1904, until July, 1911; it was then continued as the *Journal of Religious Psychology, Including Its Anthropological and Sociological Aspects,* which was issued for three years, beginning with 1912, as a quarterly, but thenceforth only irregularly until the suspension of its publication late in 1915.

to developments in America. Influences, to be sure, have played in from other lands, yet these have been not nearly so numerous or fundamental as in the case of most other domains of science; and they have been relatively inconsiderable in comparison also with the indigenous factors. In the psychology of religion American scholars were the pioneers; and they have throughout remained in the vanguard of progress.

True, as regards the particular problem of mysticism,

Under the stimulus of the general movement numerous inadequately equipped writers have published books and papers that are at best superficial, or perhaps only quasi-scientific, and that in some instances fall little short of being scientifically disreputable. Not uncommonly the aims seem to have been primarily hortatory or apologetic; and frequently one finds simply ancient truth expressed in ill-understood psychological jargon. Nevertheless, the fact that this body of writings exists bears testimony to the stimulating power of the strictly scientific investigations. Whatever its defects, moreover, it has doubtless extended the popular interest in the subject.

A good illustration of the influence of religious psychology in the general field of literature is afforded by M. R. Werner's recent book on *Brigham Young* (1925). The psychological discoveries of James and Starbuck are here given fruitful application. Use is made also of monographic studies, such as I. W. Riley's *The Founder of Mormonism: A Psychological Study of Joseph Smith* (1902), T. Schroeder's *The Sex-Determinant in Mormon Theology* (1908), W. F. Prince's paper on "Psychological Tests for the Authorship of the Book of Mormon," in *American Journal of Psychology,* July, 1917, E. E. Ericksen's *The Psychological and Ethical Aspects of Mormon Group Life* (1923).

Work has been done also on the psychology of religious sects and groups. In addition to discussions in the general treatises we would refer to a paper by Jean du Buy, "Four Types of Protestants: A Comparative Study in the Psychology of Religion," in the *American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education,* III, 165–209, and a volume by H. C. McComas on *The Psychology of Religious Sects* (1912).

G. Stanley Hall's volumes on *Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology* (1917) well indicate the achievements and the possibilities along a different line of investigation. Convinced that "the psychological Jesus Christ is the true and living Christ of the present and of the future," Hall contends that the knowledge we most require is not concerning a historical person or historical events, but concerning the spiritual Christ of the resurrection, whom alone Paul knew. The responsibility for reinterpreting to the Christian world its Lord and Master, he maintains, therefore devolves upon psychologists of religion.

France may claim a priority. Through the labors of Charcot, of his pupil, Janet, and of other leaders in abnormal psychology she early announced psychological explanations of hysteria and other non-religious phenomena similar to mysticism. This paved the way for the basic work by Murisier, *Les Maladies du Sentiment Religieux,* which appeared in 1898. Only four years elapsed, however, before Leuba, following up his earlier account of conversion, published two papers on the Christian mystics.[2] During the same year James offered a notable contribution to the subject, and soon thereafter important accretions came from Coe, Rufus Jones, and Hocking, as, more recently, from Pratt.[3] All of these gains Leuba has utilized in a recent comprehensive volume, *The Psychology of Religious Mysticism* (1925), characterized by such breadth of scope and acuteness of analysis as to demonstrate convincingly that scientific psychology may even today illumine the previously obscure recesses occupied by the complex and elusive experiences comprised within mysticism. Proceeding genetically, Leuba finds a continuity between the mystical ecstacy produced, among many peoples, by drugs and other physical means, the Yoga system of mental concentration, and the higher and most significant modes of mysticism; proceeding comparatively, he finds striking resemblances between the outstanding aspects of the latter and various scientifically explicable conditions, such as hysteria, neurasthenia, epileptic ecstacy, the sense of invisible presence, and the trance-consciousness, with its disturbances of time- and space-percep-

[2] Cf. *Revue Philosophique,* LIV (1902), 1–36; 441–87.

[3] Cf. especially Coe's paper on "Sources of the Mystical Revelation," *Hibbert Journal,* VI (1908), 359–72; Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion* (1909); Hocking's *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* (1912); the last five chapters in Pratt's *The Religious Consciousness* (1920).

tion, its photisms, and its impressions of levitation, of increased moral energy, and of ineffable revelation. For an insight into what mysticism is when interpreted from within the experience itself one may turn to Hocking, or to Bennett, a more recent writer of similar spirit.[4]

When we consider such problems as conversion, revival phenomena, normal religious growth, or the influence of adolescence upon religious life, the American primacy is indisputable. The same is true as regards general treatises in the psychology of religion, whether the question relate to priority, quality, or number of solid publications. American scholars first devised and employed empirical and inductive methods of describing religion psychologically, and in this respect also their rôle has continued to be creative.[5]

[4] Bennett's book, *A Philosophical Study of Mysticism* (1923), contains much material of psychological import.

[5] Disregarding W. S. Bruce's *Psychology of Christian Life and Behaviour* and a number of related books, as scarcely belonging to rigidly scientific literature, we have but two handbooks by British writers, both recent and both greatly indebted to American publications: R. H. Thouless, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion* (1923); W. B. Selbie, *The Psychology of Religion* (1923). On page 4 of his book Selbie writes: "But it is the Americans who are the real pioneers in the psychology of religion proper."

James's *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902) proved a vitalizing factor in Germany, particularly because of the fine translation (1907) and the subsequent discussions of G. Wobbermin. In 1911 Wundt devoted an entire chapter of his *Probleme der Völkerpsychologie* to a critical analysis of *Pragmatische und genetische Religionspsychologie*. Here James is subjected to a rather severe, though a not always justifiable, criticism. Starbuck's volume, *The Psychology of Religion* (1899), was translated by Friedrich Beta (with the assistance of G. Vorbrodt) in 1909, ever since which time it has continued to exert considerable influence. Testimony hereof, as well as of the deep traces left by G. Stanley Hall's writings, particularly his trail-blazing *Adolescence* (1904), may be found by turning to such a recent book as Spranger's *Psychologie des Jugendalters* (3d ed., 1925). As late as 1921 Scholz wrote: "Thus far American psychology has been almost alone in the endeavor to determine the various forms of the religious life." While finding points to criticize in James, and particularly in Starbuck, he concludes that their "categories

II

Beginnings are always wrapped in mystery, and something of arbitrariness is thus inevitable to history. Prior to anything that could incontestably be called a psychology of religion, there were centuries of recorded rejoicings unto the Lord, prayers, confessions, self-examinations, and other expressions of the heart in its moments of religion. "Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh." The self-conscious effort to understand something of one's inmost experience is itself so ancient as to antedate even so early a thinker as Socrates. Simple statements of a psychological character occur wher-

---

as such are important, and furnish a stimulus for the development of further concepts" (*Religionsphilosophie,* pp. 462 f.). Of the empirical methods contributed by German scholarship one, especially, deserves notice. In it the material for the psychologists' investigation is derived from the records made by individuals of (1) any spontaneous experiences of a religious character immediately after these occur; (2) their judgments, both subjective and objective, and experiences with respect to the value of selected religious texts (hymns and poems, both familiar and unfamiliar), presented, after a period of initial training, under laboratory conditions—these records being supplemented by answers to various questions raised by the investigator with regard to the judgments and experiences; (3) their spontaneous associations upon the occasion of religious stimuli; (4) their conscious data (content of experience) when required to form conceptions corresponding to various religious terms. The general method was first suggested by Külpe to a number of his students and to the Nürnberger Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Religionspsychologie. This society found a journalistic organ in the *Archiv für Religionspsychologie,* which made its appearance in 1914 under the editorship of Stählin, but fell a victim of the war. The ripest fruit, thus far, of Külpe's suggestions is a massive volume of over 700 pages by Karl Giergensohn, on *Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Erlebens* (1921). But it is interesting to note Giergensohn's testimony that his early stimulus to the study of religious psychology came, in no small measure, from American publications. These impressed him, he writes, because of their empiricism, their development of a typology, and their success in revealing the extent of what is really unknown, or but inadequately known or largely unnoticed, in the religious psychology of the individual. "To be sure," he writes, "I find that the achievements of the Americans along all three lines must be improved upon, greatly as I sympathize with their aims, and freely as I acknowledge that they have accomplished more than others" (p. 17).

ever there is religion; and even so sophisticated a doctrine as *timor fecit deos* trails back into a hoary past.

The nineteenth century began with controversies as to whether religion is essentially a matter of ideas and beliefs, as was held by many among orthodox, as well as rationalistic, thinkers; of feeling, as was urged by Schleiermacher; or of faith in the metaphysical validity of moral imperatives, and thus of will, as Kant had argued, and Fichte after him, though in somewhat altered terms. Before long, Europe's great synthetic genius, joining Kant in his unequivocal condemnation of the religion of mere feeling as *Schwärmerei,* though no less vigorously rejecting also all views resting in postulates and faith, and finding their basis in a mere ought-to-be, sought a more comprehensive formula that would give recognition to these, as to all phases of human nature, but would subordinate them to reason as the central principle of man.[6]

All of these movements had American exponents during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Of the works presaging the later psychology of religion, one of the ablest was in development of Schleiermacher. "The perennial source of religion, opened afresh in every new-born soul," contended its author, "is the feeling of absolute dependence."[7] The discussion, however, though including psychological analysis, was constantly diverted to philosophical problems and was obviously motivated by other than strictly scientific interests.

[6] Hegel's doctrine has frequently been characterized as intellectualistic, and as such has been contrasted with views described as affectivistic and voluntaristic (cf. Leuba's *A Psychological Study of Religion,* p. 344). Leuba has performed a valuable service in bringing together in the appendix to this volume forty-eight distinct definitions of religion from writers worthy of note. But he should have included a rubric for synthetic definitions, and among these would belong that of Hegel, as well as many neo-Hegelians. I have touched upon this point in a paper, "Bosanquet's Interpretation of Religious Experience," *Philosophical Review,* XXXII, 652 ff.

[7] Newman Smyth, *The Religious Feeling* (1877).

The same must be said of a more important book that appeared slightly earlier: Brinton's *The Religious Sentiment: Its Source and Aim* (1876). Based as it was on a study of the religions of the American Indians, this investigation was to a certain extent inductive. Its central problem, "What, in the mind of man, gave birth to religion in any of its forms?" was fused, however, with such other questions as, "Is religion a transient phase of development, or is it the chief end of man?" "What is its warrant of continuance?" "If it overlive this day of crumbling theologies, whence will come its reprieve?" The generating motive of religion is termed the religious sentiment, and this is said to express "unfulfilled desire." The desire in question, however, is alleged to be "peculiar, as dependent on unknown power. Material advantages do not gratify it, nor even spiritual joy, when regarded as a personal sentiment. Preservation by and through relation to absolute intelligence has appeared to be the meaning of that 'love of God' which alone yields it satisfaction" (p. 275 f.). Continued, thus, are the logical defects of a faculty psychology—religious phenomena are accounted for in terms of a postulated religious sentiment the nature of which is determined by reference to that which it is designed to explain. A very considerable advance is therefore registered by Marshall's *Instinct and Reason* (1898). Religion is here indeed referred to a "religious instinct," yet this is described in its relation to other inborn tendencies. It is said to be a "governing instinct." Its function is to "emphasize within us instinct in general, and to subordinate variance; to strengthen the instincts of social influence, and to subordinate those that are less broad in their influence although occasionally more powerfully developed" (p. 248).

The notion of a religious instinct carried over even into the twentieth century.[8] In strictly scientific work, however, it was soon superseded. Precisely herein consists one of the striking advances of the past quarter-century. Previously, religion was for the most part explained in terms of some faculty or ultimate religious element in man's mental nature—some original feeling, sentiment, or instinct of a specifically religious character. During the decades just past analysis has been carried farther and religion has been given its setting within the development of human nature as a whole and the life-processes of individuals or of groups. Numerous and varied are the competing doctrines. Religion is described as (1) the vicarious and symbolical expression of (*a*) balked or (*b*) repressed tendencies;[9] (2) a sex-ecstasy, its universality and alleged innateness being due to these characteristics of the sex impulse, and its sacredness and mysticism to the fact that these qualities attach to procreation and sex generally;[10] (3)

[8] See, for example, Morris Jastrow's *The Study of Religion* (1902). In my student notes of lectures delivered by Professor Starbuck in 1907, religion is described as a "regulative" and a "governing" instinct, in a manner somewhat reminiscent of Marshall. Elsewhere, however, Starbuck refers to religion as a blending of a "cosmo-aesthetic" with a "teleo-aesthetic" sense, resulting in a "delicate sense of proportion, or relation, or fitness, or harmony that directs consciousness and determines at each point the particular advantageous response or emphasis" (*Psychological Bulletin,* VIII, 52 f.). Hocking uses the term "instinct," but with a novel connotation, connected with the fact that his viewpoint and concern are primarily noetic and metaphysical-psychological, rather than strictly phenomenological: "There must be a distinct place in the economy of life for the cult of the absolute in its contrast with life, and if religion is the name of this place, the instinctive motive of religion would be a specific craving due, whether so understood or not, to the atrophy of social and aesthetic values, a *craving for the restoration of creative power*" (*Human Nature and Its Remaking,* p. 331 n.).

[9] The former by such naturalistic writers as Santayana and Kallen; the latter by Freudians and psychoanalysts, as by Martin, in *The Mystery of Religion* (1924).

[10] On the basis of his conviction that the "acquisition of religion is a distinctly adolescent phenomenon," and of his investigations of Mormonism as of various cases

the resultant of fusions and sublimations of primary instincts or "senses," and of subsequent mental organization;[11] (4) an organization of instinctive tendencies centering about, and evoked by, various objects, primary among which is "the Agency through which the conservation of socially recognized values is sought"—namely, among advanced peoples, God; associated therewith, however, are numerous other objects, according to the particular religion (in the case of Judaism, e.g., "the law, the synagogue, the feasts, fasts, and other sacred days and observances");[12] (5) an experience the form

---

of religious fanaticism among individuals, T. Schroeder reaches the generalization that "all religion . . . . is only a sex ecstacy, seldom recognized to be that, and therefore easily and actually misinterpreted as a mysterious 'transcendental' or superphysical, undiscriminating witness to the inerrancy of all those varying and often contradictory doctrines and ceremonies believed to be of superphysical value in the promotion of present material, ecstatic, or post-mortem well-being, and which, in the mind of the believing person, happen to be associated with, and to be conceived as attached to, the feeling-testimony" (*Psychoanalytic Review,* I, 148; for a bibliography of Schroeder's earlier writings, from 1907 on, cf. *ibid.,* p. 129 n.; for later papers see the same *Review,* XII, 16–29 and 414–19). In this same *Review,* and elsewhere, Van Teslaar, during 1915, after criticizing other writers, contended that it is in Schroeder's erotogenetic theory that we must seek for the beginnings of a true psychology of religion. For a brief reference to related views in German writings, and for critical comments, the reader may be directed to Pratt's *The Religious Consciousness,* pp. 111–13, with the footnotes. As Pratt notes, an effective criticism of this whole doctrine was given by James, as early as 1902, in his *Varieties,* footnote to pages 10–12. This should long ago have given it the coup de grace and have made even the earliest of Schroeder's formulations anachronistic.

[11] See McDougall's *An Introduction to Social Psychology* and the reference, in footnote 8, to Starbuck.

[12] Quotations from W. K. Wright's *A Student's Philosophy of Religion,* p. 222. The particular concept of "sentiment" here employed is borrowed from A. Shand, who has made thereby a rich contribution to psychology. To afford a glimpse of its application to religious psychology we might note that the primary instincts and emotions involved in the religious sentiment of the civilized European and American are listed by Wright as follows: "Tender emotion, fear, intellectual curiosity, and gregariousness. The last manifests itself in the desires for divine companionship and for sociability with one's fellow-communicants. The non-specific tendencies—imita-

of which is determined by the inborn nature of the individual, but the matter, or particular content, of which is derived from his social milieu;[13] (6) the consciousness of the supreme concerns and dominant values of the group, these latter, in turn, depending upon the activities of the group as determined by the relation of the social and physical environment to the fundamental instincts or needs of man;[14] (7) a manifestation of a tendency ever present in human nature to transform and idealize its world (through such processes, for example, as action, imagination, further discovery of truth), culminating in the idea of the perfect and the best—an idea molded by a multiplicity of factors, including "sensuous pleasure and love of action, together with the curiosity for causes, the need of logical sufficiency, the delight in beauty, the sense of the importance of the family, of larger human unions and the lordship and magistracy which accompany these, and, finally, of the golden gifts of friendship";[15] (8) following from a predetermination to the organization of a distinctively human mode of experience—a process in which one idealizes any object in which he takes an absorbing interest—one "organizes other

---

tion, suggestion, and sympathy—also obviously contribute to the strengthening of the sentiment." Present also are complex emotions, such as "admiration, awe, gratitude, and reverence"; the sentiments of "love" and all the emotions and sentiments connected with the "conservation of the higher moral values," among which are those "felt toward courage, purity of heart, wisdom, self-control, physical and moral courage, justice, and all the other virtues to which one aspires"; also "impulses connected with the desire for forgiveness of sins and the eradication from one's personality of all that is morally painful to contemplate" (p. 223).

[13] So Pratt, in *The Religious Consciousness,* pp. 74 ff.

[14] Especially by Irving King in *The Differentiation of the Religious Consciousness* (1905) and *The Development of Religion* (1910), and Edward S. Ames, in *The Psychology of Religious Experience* (1910).

[15] G. M. Stratton, *The Psychology of the Religious Life* (1911), p. 332.

interests about it, and thus finds one's real world partly by having a share in making it real"—the organization involving also and more especially the coming to their proper pre-eminence of "the social instincts";[16] (9) a manifestation within individual experience of collective representations,[17] or (10) of ideas and values having their source in the mental life of the folk or community.[18]

III

The preceding sketch will already have afforded an indirect glimpse at one of the motivations to the psychological study of religion. During the eighteenth century religion entered into a period of intense self-consciousness. It was being subjected to various criticisms and attacks, and many of the things sacred to it were explained in terms of human invention and the designs of a cunning priestcraft. In consequence, those who enjoyed a living realization of its worth felt an urge to

[16] This is the thesis of Coe's *The Psychology of Religion* (1916). A particularly useful feature of this book is a carefully selected bibliography, presented both alphabetically and topically; King has given a useful list of publications, selected with a somewhat different interest, in his *Development of Religion,* and Pratt has compiled a selected bibliography in Appendix B of his *Psychology of Religious Belief* (1908). So far as purely bibliographical purposes are concerned, we are therefore restricting ourselves to the mention of only the important publications of the last decade.

[17] The thesis of Durkheim and his school, yet considerably discussed and not without influence in America. See the bibliography in Coe (p. 331), and a paper by the present writer, on "A Sociological Theory of Knowledge," *Philosophical Review,* July, 1920.

[18] This doctrine of Wundt's, more pronounced in his comprehensive *Völkerpsychologie* than in the briefer exposition translated by me in 1916 under the title *Elements of Folk Psychology,* was not without influence upon Royce, particularly in his *The Problem of Christianity* (1913). "Following Wundt," he writes, "I have already said that it is the community which produces languages, customs, religions. These are, all of them, intelligent mental products, which can be psychologically analyzed, which follow psychological laws, and which exhibit characteristic processes of mental evolution—processes that belong solely to organized groups of men" (Vol. I, p. 65).

understand their cherished experiences and the sources from which they spring. Hence the deservedly famous *Reden* of Schleiermacher, with the impulsion they gave to the subsequent psychological study of religion.

But another motivation has clearly been active. It is bound up with man's nature progressively to strive for a profounder knowledge of himself. This leads to an investigation of religion, for religion carries one into the deeper regions of the soul. This need of self-knowledge, like that arising from within religious experience, became intensified as the opportunities for satisfaction became more promising. Now, during the latter part of the nineteenth century, laboratory methods came to be applied to psychological investigation. The growth of empirical procedure gave an amazing impetus to physiological, animal, genetic, abnormal, and finally social, psychology; abnormal psychology, too, and psychotherapy were making rapid advances. This not merely provided improved means for satisfying the demands already referred to; it became an added motivation to the psychological study of religion. The question arose: Is psychology competent throughout all the ranges of experience, or does it strike upon insuperable limits in the case, for example, of religious awakening, conversion, mysticism, inspiration, and similar phenomena? And then, also, historians of religion, as well as of culture generally, anthropologists, sociologists, and philosophers, added to the pressure for a thoroughly scientific psychology of religion that would offer a key for the understanding of central and recurrent social concepts and practices. Practical interests, too, played a large rôle: more especially the desire for more significant achievement in religious training and education, in the equipment of religious workers, and in the promo-

tion of a truer understanding and a wider sympathy between differently minded groups. These motivations are clearly reflected in the American literature on the psychology of religion. The progress made by the latter may consequently be gauged with considerable reliability by the extent to which it has ministered to the generating needs indicated.

It was early in the eighties that G. Stanley Hall began lecturing and writing on *The Moral and Religious Training of Children and Adolescents*. By the end of the century important contributions to the subject were made by a considerable number of writers, such as Burnham, Daniels, Leuba, Starbuck, and Lancaster.[19] Then the work continued with growing momentum. Today even a sketch of its conclusions and its influence upon church and community activities and our entire religious and theological orientation would occupy a generous volume.

Abroad, the psychology of religion in America is even yet associated primarily with the use of the questionnaire and of biographical materials. As regards the former, the major credit belongs to E. D. Starbuck. Stirred, in 1890, by Max Müller's *Introduction to the Science of Religion* and kindred works, he dedicated himself to the task of applying psychological methods in the interpretation of religion. Three years later he put out two questionnaires, one on conversion and the other on gradual growth not attended by conversion. The outcome was his *The Psychology of Religion* (1899), the first volume to appear on this subject.

Important as were the findings of Starbuck, and the other early writers mentioned, regarding conversion, particularly

[19] For detailed statements, see Hall's *Adolescence*, II, 292; and Pratt's paper on "The Psychology of Religion," in the *Harvard Theological Review*, I (1908), 435–54.

among adolescents, the close of the century could as yet boast of only the beginnings of knowledge. But then came a rapid succession of significant contributions from Coe, James, Prince, and others; and interpretation has become increasingly clear and subtle. The result is that we today understand adolescent conversion fully as well as many less complex experiences whose study goes back far longer. Reliable knowledge is at hand concerning the ages of its greatest frequency, and correlations with other changes, physiological as well as psychological; concerning the motivations, subjective and objective, egoistic and social; concerning physiological, psychological, and social causes of the conviction of sins or of sin, as the case may be, as also of the conversion; concerning differences as between the sexes; concerning the influence of temperament and degrees and type of suggestibility; concerning its typology and the permanence and value of the various types. Through his timely volume on *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals* (1905) Davenport focused attention upon related problems. Keys for their solution have been found in the laws of rhythm and of crowd psychology. Questions and differences of opinion still remain. But these affect only details. Revivals as such, pentecosts and their concomitant phenomena, such as "speaking with tongues," are no longer shrouded in mystery.

In the classic work through which he gave to the psychology of religion the greatest single impetus in its history, James described the religion of "healthy-mindedness" in contrast with that of the "sick soul" and "the divided self," and portrayed the characteristics and value of saintliness and of mysticism with all the vividness and originality of his rare genius. Whereas, however, it seemed to many that the results already

achieved were sufficient to indicate the essential unity and continuity of individual experience and the possibility of an adequate psychological interpretation of religion without recourse to supernatural or transcendent causes, James concluded that "we have, in the fact that the conscious person is continuous with a wider self through which saving experiences come, a positive content of religious experience which, it seems to me, is literally and objectively true as far as it goes" (p. 515). This view was eagerly seized upon by many who were perturbed over the rising tide of what they considered a dangerous naturalism. Of this literature, one volume here deserves mention, not because it contributed to methodology or to scientific knowledge, but because it popularized many of the established conclusions and spread interest in the subject. We refer to Cutten's *The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity* (1908). For many writers less informed and competent than Cutten, James's view became simply an asylum for psychological indolence and ignorance. From two sides, however, James's view has been subjected to disintegrating forces. Remarkable success has actually been achieved, particularly since the vigorous development of abnormal psychology, in explaining many phenomena that formerly seemed inexplicable; furthermore, philosophy has become more emphatic concerning the logic of science. Psychologists have thus come very generally to realize that they have no more need of "the hypothesis of God" in their specific task than had La Place in his.

To many it long seemed that the questionnaire, affording direct glimpses, as it does, of living experiences, represents the most valuable, as well as the most convenient, source of religious facts. Undeniably it has borne much good fruit. Beyond

the sphere of its original use it has been applied with noteworthy results to studies relating to the belief, as well as the disbelief, in God and in immortality, and, more particularly, to the prevalence of these beliefs and disbeliefs among various groups of American scholars.[20] The limitations of the questionnaire method have, however, become increasingly apparent—limitations with respect alike to the objectivity and reliability of its data and the range of its applicability. In connection with problems confronting students of the beginnings or the history of religion or challenging the anthropologist and sociologist, it was practically useless. But soon an approach to these problems was discovered. Under the influence of biological evolution psychology came to stress interpretation in terms of development from the primitive to the advanced and complex; and it came to regard ideas, and consciousness generally, as instruments through which organisms achieve, or at any rate seek, more satisfactory adjustments to their environment. Psychical processes were said to emerge on the occasion of perplexing situations, and to develop, at least initially, under the control of natural and social selection. According to this functionalistic doctrine religion too has its source in the disparity between human needs and prevailing circumstances. For it, ceremonial, as a mode of securing the satisfaction of basic social needs, naturally becomes the central feature of religion, the primary source of religious feelings and institutions, no less than of myths, beliefs, and the most elaborate creeds. God is conceived, not as an object of meditation or cognition, but as a power that is invoked in order to be used.

[20] For the general problem, see Pratt's *The Religious Consciousness,* chaps. x and xi, with their references to other investigations in the footnotes to pages 203 and 233. For the more particular problem, see Leuba's *The Belief in God and Immortality* (1916), Part II.

Changes in the conditions of life, and thus in its values, cause the twilight of the older gods and the appearance of new cult-acts and beliefs. God becomes a symbol of supreme social values. Disloyalty to the latter thus constitutes irreligion; insensitiveness or indifference to them, non-religion. This functional outlook proved helpful, particularly in the understanding of taboo, magic, fetishism, ceremonial practices, and the simpler religions generally. But it came far from giving adequate recognition to, or just appraisal of, mysticism, adoration, the theoretical, contemplative, and characteristically social (as distinct from the utilitarian) aspects of religion, particularly in its more advanced manifestations. The viewpoint, although allegedly genetic and functional, was not genuinely so. It failed to consider that even though conscious processes may in their beginnings be (largely, we would say) subservient to the demands of life, they in time win their emancipation and become ends in themselves, masters no less truly than servants. They develop along autonomous lines, under the guidance of self-critical reason and consciously evaluated norms. They initiate novel insights and values, beside conserving those attested in the past.[21] Thus, in its characteristic manifestations, mind is not an instrument of adaptation, but a principle of conscious aspiration, a nisus toward more rational, social, universal, and thus perfect, selfhood. Defining a person as "any reactor that approves or disapproves its own reactions, or that realizes consequences as successes or failures

[21] I have given a somewhat detailed analysis and evaluation of this movement, as represented outstandingly by King and Ames, in a contribution to *Essays in Honor of J. E. Creighton* (1917). Leuba's *A Psychological Study of Religion* (1912) espouses a functionalism of a different and more elastic sort. Its chapter on "The Several Origins of the Ideas of Unseen Personal Beings," for example, is one of the most intellectually catholic, as well as valuable, of all briefer treatments of this subject.

of its own," Coe has utilized in the psychology of religion a functionalism that is at once more empirical and genetic, and more significant, than that of the earlier writers on this subject.[22] Religion becomes a genuinely social experience in which self-conscious persons, through fellowship with their neighbors, devotion to the community, and worship of its indwelling spirit, seek for larger realization with increasing self-knowledge and a more delicate sense of ethical, aesthetic, cognitive, and social values.[23]

The discovery of the subliminal consciousness was declared by James to be the most important forward step in the psychology of the late decades of the nineteenth century. Certainly the discovery has proved of prime significance to the psychology of religion. It played no small part in laying the foundations of the new science. And, though specific formulations of the subconscious—as marginal or subliminal consciousness, as co-consciousness, as unconscious, repressed psychical states or tendencies—have been subjected to vigorous, and often damaging, criticism, the psychology of religion has, throughout its history, leaned heavily upon the doctrine in some form or other. Testimony hereof is offered by almost all of the more determined efforts to account for such phenomena as inspiration, conversion, mysticism, saintliness, faith, automatisms, convictions that certain truths or mandates are "from above," and various visual and auditory experiences.

[22] *The Psychology of Religion* (1916).

[23] This is in essential harmony with the thought of Royce when he affirms that the essence of a religion "free from superstition" and "in harmony with a genuinely rational view of the world" is to be found in loyalty, defined as the willing, wholehearted, and thoroughgoing devotion of a person to a cause inclusive of himself and his fellows. *Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908); *William James and Other Essays on the Philosophy of Life* (1912); *The Sources of Religious Insight* (1912); *The Problem of Christianity* (1913).

From the beginning on, moreover, it was recognized that many historical features of advanced as well as primitive religions must be classed as distinctly pathological.[24] It was not until very recently, however, that the psychoanalytic viewpoint and the method of psychopathology have been applied to religion as a whole in any American treatise. In his *The Mystery of Religion* (1924), this has now been done by E. D. Martin. Experienced conflicts between the ideal self and conscious elements, we are told, give rise to efforts at self-mastery and the control of the environment. But conflicts between the ideal self and elements that are unconscious because repressed, generate dreams, neurotic symptoms, and religion. The various symbols, cult-acts, and creeds of religion, the experiences of sin and redemption, the formation and the unique authority of religious organizations and communities—all are referred to principles of repression, regression, inferiority feelings and complexes, family images, perverse tendencies, and the factors exhibited throughout in compulsive behavior and in obsessions. Many psychologists turn to the self-conscious experience of themselves or their fellows, or perhaps to overt behavior, for a plain tale as to what man does, cherishes, thinks, and seeks. Martin, however, believes that this procedure affords at best symptomatic data which, if supplemented by a knowledge of myths, acts of cult, and other similarly objective phenomena, enable the psychopathologist to determine what a man actually is doing when he himself, and a non-initiated psychologist as well, supposes that he is doing something very different. Martin makes a number of neat distinctions and

[24] One of the items in the initial program of the *American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education* was religious pathology, and in Volume I of its *Monograph Supplement* (1906) there is a study by Josiah Moses on "Pathological Aspects of Religions." Much material is to be found also in the *Psychoanalytic Review*.

acute observations, counteracting the contentions of eighteenth-century rationalists and of certain present-day functionalists that Christianity and religion are "not mysterious" but plain reason or adaptive social behavior. Most of his explanations of the deeper and "hidden" things of the religious life, however, must strike one who is not committed in advance to his psychological viewpoint as forced to the point of grotesqueness.

Very different, and of the very first importance, have been Stratton's attempts to study the religious life of peoples, not by the use of questionnaires, autobiographies, or other self-conscious expressions, but when men "are off their guard," as in the case of the prayer, the hymn, the myth, the sacred prophecy.[25] Turning to the great canonical collections which large numbers have accepted and made the bases of their creeds, to epics and reliable accounts of customs and observances, he believes himself to have discovered religion as it is. Analyzing the data, he everywhere finds contrasts and conflicts, not merely as between, but also within, each of the particular religions. As to feeling and emotion, he comes upon conflicts between appreciation and contempt of self, breadth and narrowness of sympathy, acceptance and renunciation of the world, gloom and cheer, suppression and intensification of emotions. In regard to action, similarly, there are conflicts between the elaboration of, and coolness toward, rites, between activity and reverent inaction. In religious thought, divinity is regarded as at once near and afar off, known and unknown, many and one, to be portrayed and made real through description and image while yet unimaginable and properly an object of thought or even of reference alone—in-

[25] *The Psychology of the Religious Life* (1911); *Anger: Its Religious and Moral Significance* (1923).

deed, there is at once trust and jealousy of intellect. Generally, to be sure, one of these antithetical phases is paramount. Thus, with reference to anger, one may speak of "irate and martial" religions (Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam), "unangry" religions (Taoism, Vishnuism, Buddhism, Jainism), and religions of "anger-supported love" (Confucianism, Christianity). Nowhere else have the various sources of these antinomies, or the particular forms they have assumed within religion, been set forth with comparable skill or suggestiveness.

IV

The wide differences indicated with respect to viewpoint, methods, and conclusions in the psychology of religion are, to a certain extent, a disclosure of the immaturity of the science and of the uncertainty that prevails, today perhaps more strongly than ever, with respect to the task of psychology in general. No less truly, however, do they testify to the vitality, independence, and originality of American scholarship in this field, and its promise for the quarter-century just begun. Religion comprises some of the most complex, protean, and elusive of human experiences. In respect to it, therefore, agreement as regards the proper psychological procedure will doubtless be difficult to achieve. But from a critical observation of the successes and the failures of the past twenty-five years the present psychologist of religion may derive various warnings, such as: (1) against construing data in the light of conceptions as to what constitutes a tenable or valid religion, or of the conviction that all religion is prelogical, pathological, or the vicarious satisfaction of repressed desires; (2) against bringing to its study the doctrine of some one of the psychological schools, either for the sake of thus further illustrating

and confirming it, or in the belief therein to possess a net within which to catch the whole of religious phenomena; (3) against the notion that at all levels of religious development the sole legitimate method consists in psychologizing "from without," in treating experiences as non-conscious entities having no story of their own to report; against such infatuation with natural science and such fear of philosophy as to shrink from adopting also the standpoint of religious experience itself, and seeking thus to learn its intentions, claims, possessions, and satisfactions, and the values which it either accepts or creates, whether for contemplation or for championship, for the appraisal of man's own nature and conduct, and of events, or for loyal devotion—for such valuations are central, constitutive facts of self-conscious experience, and their recognition is no less demanded by a thorough-going empiricism than is the observance of the two warnings first mentioned; (4) against any complacent repose in ultimates (whether it be divine causation or innate religious elements) that tend both to discourage further psychological analysis and to isolate religion from the rest of life; but likewise against such an identification of religion with humanism, democracy, social justice, moral reform, philosophic quests or beliefs, or the ontological aspect of experience in general, as to deprive it of its uniqueness or, indeed, fail altogether to find it; (5) against conceiving the psychology of religion so narrowly, or developing it in such independence of general psychology, as to lose valuable accretions available, just at present, for example, in personnel and character study, in endocrine psychology, and in the methods of statistical comparisons, including those by correlations in which evaluations are achieved, singly and severally, of the interacting elements in

combinations of relations;[26] (6) against studying experiences without full reference to their historical and environmental settings, and thus running the danger of interpreting as traits of individual human nature what may be the conventions of tradition or theology—as characteristics of adolescence, for example, what may be simply results of evangelical doctrines relating to sin and salvation—or as sex differences what are simply differences as between the sexes under the prevailing modes of life, or as true of all what holds only of those living within a certain milieu.

[26] The printed outlines of the lectures delivered by Professor Starbuck in Oslo this past fall would indicate that he has already achieved valuable results by this method with regard to "conservatives" in distinction from "radicals" and of the "mystical" in distinction from the "practical-minded" types in religion.

HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

A. EUSTACE HAYDON

The closing decades of the nineteenth century forecast a new era in the study of religions. Scholars talked easily of the "science of religion," of the "religious sciences." It was the sign of a new spirit, a thrust toward objectivity, an effort to escape the hampering hand of apologetics. There had been encyclopedias and histories of religions for centuries; now there was to be scientific history. The new science found an eager welcome and a swift embodiment. University chairs and departments were given over to it. At the opening of the first decade there were chairs in the History of Religions in Holland, Switzerland, France, England, Italy, Denmark, Belgium, and America. It soon acquired special lectureship foundations,[1] its own journals[2] and textbooks.[3] While the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago, in 1893, was for the most part an international gesture of good will, there followed the international congresses of History of Religions, quadrennial gatherings of scholars in the religious sciences.[4] The new dis-

[1] The Hibbert Lectures (1878); The Gifford Lectures (1888); The American Lectures on History of Religions (1892); The Haskell Lectures (1894).

[2] *Revue de l'histoire des religions* (1880); *Muséon* (1882), combined with *Le Revue des Religions* in 1899, taking final form as *Muséon Études philologiques, historiques et religieuses* (1900); *Année sociologique* (1896); *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1898).

[3] Chantepie de la Saussaye: *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (1887–89); Tiele: *Geschiedenis van der Godsdienst* (1876, Eng. Trans. 1877); Menzies: *History of Religion* (1895); Orelli: *Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte* (1899); Lamers: *Wetenschap van der Godsdienst* (1896–98).

[4] Paris, 1900; Basel, 1904; Oxford, 1908; Leiden, 1912; Paris, 1923.

cipline had won an assured place in the important universities and in public esteem. Specialists in all the sciences dealing with human culture contributed to its development.

No new science is altogether new. It builds on and out of the past. The science of religion found itself immersed in a vast heritage of religious philosophies, materials, and methods. To remain immune in the presence of dominant philosophies is especially difficult for the student of religions. Hegel, Schleiermacher, and Comte represented three different ways of understanding religion and of organizing the religions of the world; Kant, Ritschl, and Spencer, three ways of harmonizing religion with science. A new and challenging philosophy was also in the field, evolutionary empiricism, grounded on the scientific theories of Darwin. Many a historian of the last quarter-century has escaped the revelation dogmas of the theologian only to yield to the more subtle influence of these philosophies with the resultant warping of method and coloring of interpretation.

The heritage of materials and instruments of research was immense and invaluable. It is impossible and fortunately unnecessary to record here a dry catalogue of names and achievements in pre-twentieth-century research. All the fields of human culture and religion had been worked and significant gains won. Prehistory began to reveal its secrets in the middle of the nineteenth century. Archaeology[5] had opened to view the past of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria, and the key to the ancient writings had been found, for Egypt by Champollion, for the cuneiform by Grotefend, Hincks, Rawlinson, and Oppert. The scholarship of all lands turned to this fascinating and fertile field. The romance of research records great names

[5] Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands during the Nineteenth Century* (1903).

—Jastrow, Sayce, Maspero, de Morgan, Naville, Renouf, Petrie, Erman, Capart, Breasted, Schiaparelli—these out of many who worked before and into the twenty-five years of our survey. The Graeco-Roman world had for a century been the source of materials for the interpretation of religion. The mythologies were common property. It was on this basis that Creuzer[6] had built his symbolic interpretation. On this Wolf founded his new criticism. In this field K. O. Mueller[7] began the building of the historical method. Archaeology here opened new vistas of pre-hellenic cultures and challenged the old interpretations. Parallel achievements had been won in the Orient. Anquetil-Duperron, 1771, Eugene Burnouf, 1835, found the key to the sacred books of Iran. Bopp, Burnouf, and Christian Lassen, following preliminary work by others, made Sanskrit and Pali available. The scriptures and literatures of the Indo-iranians were opened. The religions of Persia and India began to appear in historic perspective. Translations came in a flood. Remusat, Julien, and Legge opened the archives of China's literature. Buddhism had been studied in the various lands by Remusat, Hodgson, Czoma, Turnour, Mouhat, Schmidt, and interpretation of Buddhist history was in full flower before the opening of the century. Islam, known and feared for almost a millenium, had fared badly at the hands of interpreters until the last quarter of the century. Then Doughty, Wellhausen, Noeldeke, Goldziher, Caetani opened the way for scientific history. Work had already been done on the religions of pre-Christian Europe, the Teutons, Celts, and Slavs but with conflicting results. Materials from

[6] Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker besonders der Griechen (4v., 1819–21).

[7] *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie* (1825).

Japan were available in the translations of Satow, Aston, Florenz, and Chamberlain. Commerce, adventure, science, and missions had for centuries collaborated in collecting materials relative to the backward peoples of the earth. What seemed to scholars of that time the most important religious materials of culture peoples, their sacred scriptures, were from 1879 onward under the editorship of Max Müller translated in the *Sacred Books of the East*. From pre-Columbian America to prehistoric Egypt the whole world offered endless materials for the religious scientists. Religion appeared to be a normal, universal, and integral phase of every human culture. Comparative science had achieved inspiring results in biology and linguistics. Votaries of the new science turned to the world-wide wealth of data in high hope of being able to discover the laws of religious evolution and to write the religious history of mankind.

There was, however, the problem of method. The exploitation of the materials of religion had been undertaken by no less than five distinct schools, each with its own method. The chief of the philological group was Max Müller, who had made a brilliant application of comparative philology in the study of mythology and then turned to the interpretation of religion in the opening lectures of the Hibbert[8] and Gifford[9] foundations. The anthropological school was interested chiefly in primitive religions. Its outstanding figures before the opening of the century were Tylor,[10] Frazer,[11] and Lang.[12] The method

[8] *The Origin and Growth of Religion As Illustrated by the Religions of India* (1878).

[9] *Natural Religion* (1888), *Physical Religion* (1890), *Anthropological Religion* (1891), *Psychological Religion* (1892).

[10] *Primitive Culture* (1871). [11] *The Golden Bough* (1890).

[12] *The Making of Religion* (1898).

of both of these groups was comparative and psychological. Not to be classified in any school but of great influence was Herbert Spencer, who began with religious origins in his *Principles of Sociology* (1876–96). In the closing decades of the century Durkheim[13] announced a new sociological method. Earlier, in Germany, Lazarus and Steinthal, later joined by Wundt, had established the *Völkerpsychologie*. In addition to these there were the scholars who continued the tradition of the historical school—Albert and Jean Réville, von Orelli, Chantepie de la Saussaye, Maurice Vernes, Tiele, and many specialists in the realm of a single religion. The new history and the new ethnology had not yet appeared. The conflict of methods, the experience of futility and failure were needed to make clear the nature of scientific method in the study of religions.

The sketch of the progress of twenty-five years falls easily into three divisions—a survey of notable achievements in the various departments of history of religions, an account of the change in methods, and a study of the gradual clarification of the definition of religion.

I

Of general reference works the period has produced two—*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (5v., 1909–13) and *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (12v., 1908–21). This latter work deals with all phases of religions from primitivity to modern times and in addition treats those elements of religious activity and thought which can be gathered under rubrics such as "magic," "demons and spirits," etc. in symposiums where specialists present the materials of their

[13] *Les Règles de la méthode sociologique* (1895).

own field. For source material on the world's scriptures the *Sacred Books of the East* has been the standard work. Now the *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* of Göttingen has undertaken the publication in twelve groups of the literature of all peoples under the title, *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte* (1913——). The groups include Europe, the early Semites and Egypt, Judaism, Gnosticism, Iran, Islam, India, Buddhism, China-Japan-Mongolia, Africa, America, the primitives of the south seas and south Asia. Volumes in several groups have already appeared.

In view of the great increase of materials and the demands of the more modern method it is becoming more difficult for any single scholar to write a general history of religions. American scholars still attempt such surveys, however, with creditable results.[14] In Europe the general history is done in collaboration. The most notable of these new handbooks is the *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (2v. 1924–25), edited by Bertholet and Lehmann and written by specialists of international authority.

Opening his lectures at the Collège de France, in 1908, Jean Réville referred to the need of a history of the history of religions and sketched its outlines. Many scholars have contributed to the structure.[15] The work has been completed in a

[14] Hopkins, *History of Religions* (1918); Moore, *History of Religions* (Vol. I, 1913, 2d ed. 1920, Vol. II, 1919). Other works, but with an apologetic cast are Soper, *The Religions of Mankind* (1921); Barton, *The Religions of the World* (1919); Hume, *The World's Living Religions* (1924).

[15] Jastrow, *The Study of Religion* (1901), pp. 1–57; Hardy, "Zur Geschichte der vergleichenden Religionsforschung," *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft* (1901); Jordan, *Comparative Religion, Its Genesis and Growth* (1905); J. Réville, *Les phases successives de l'histoire des religions* (1909); Beth, *Einführung in die Verge. Religionsgeschichte* (1920); Gruppe, *Geschichte der klassischen Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (1921); Lehmann, "Zur Geschichte der Religionsgeschichte," in Bertholet and Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (1924), I, 1–22.

masterly way by H. Pinard de la Boullaye. His *L'Étude comparée des Religions* (Vol. I, *Son histoire dans le monde occidental,* 1922), is a marvel of painstaking erudition and adds one more item to the debt of the science of religion to Jesuit scholarship.

The area of primitive religions has been a battle-ground. Inspired by the evolutionary hypothesis scholars undertook to find the law of religious evolution. This involved arranging the phenomena found among preliterate peoples in the order of their appearance in the history of the race. The difficulty was to know what was the ultimate starting-point. Primitive revelation had few adherents among the new scientists and Lubbock's primitive atheism was contradicted by the evidence of ideas of extra-human powers in all early cultures. The fetish theory of De Brosses was discarded. Leon Marillier followed Guyau and started with panthelism. Tyler's animism, presented in his scholarly *Primitive Culture,* seemed destined to capture the best minds. Albert Réville, however, among others insisted that the naturism of Max Müller might be equally as early as animism. With the discovery of the "mana" words in all parts of the world there developed the theory of preanimism, suggested by Preuss, followed by Marett, Hartland, Lowie, and others. As interest turned to the group control of religion the Durkheim school placed totemism at the beginning, others began with the primary needs of food and sex. Andrew Lang and the Catholic school defended the thesis of primitive monotheism. In addition to the difficulty of determining the ultimate primordium there was also the problem of the priority of magic or religion. Out of these con-

flicts of opinion grew an immense literature, to the great illumination of the primitive field.[16]

The controversies centered about totemism, the relation of magic to religion, and the "high gods" of the primitives. The debate over totemism was shared by Frazer, Jevons, Marillier, Lang, Reinach, Wundt, de Visser, Toutain, Loisy, Durkheim, Söderblom, Lowie, Goldenweiser, Schmidt, and van Gennep. It was discovered that totemism was not universal, was not the earliest form of religion, and assumed different forms and meanings according to place and time.[17] The magic-religion controversy ended in the same clarification. When the actual behavior was studied neglecting the nebulous words "magic" and "religion" it was seen that the same mechanism and extra-human power were involved in rites classed under both heads, and that the two formed one complex in primitive life. Some of these activities however were approved and some disapproved by the group, the latter tending to form a feared and forbidden class.[18] The status of the high gods[19] of early peo-

[16] A vast store of materials is in Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (12v., 1907–13); Typical uses of the materials in Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions* (4v., 1904–12); Toy, *Introduction to the Study of Religions* (1913); Hopkins, *The Origin and Evolution of Religion* (1923); Moore, *The Birth and Growth of Religion* (1924); Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* (1912, Eng. trans. 1915).

[17] Van Gennep, *L'état actuel du problème totemique* (1920); Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy* (4v., 1910–11); Goldenweiser, "Totenism, an Analytical Study," *Jour. of Amer. Folklore,* Vol. XXIII (1910); many writers in *Anthropos,* Vol. IX (1914) ff.

[18] Marett, *The Threshold of Religion* (1914); "Magic (Primitive)," *E. R. E.*; Goldenweiser, "Magic and Religion," *Psychological Bulletin,* March, 1919, pp. 83–89, Bibliography.

[19] Lang, *The Making of Religion* (1898); Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidée* (1914), a survey of opinions; Söderblom, in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* XVII (1914), 1–16; Pettazzoni, *Dio, Formazione e sviluppo del monoteismo nella storia della religioni* (1922).

ples is still unsettled. Catholic scholars find them where others do not. Söderblom thinks they are vaguely conceived *Urheber,* creators or authors of the world. Pettazzoni, in an extensive survey, makes the attractive suggestion that they represent the reaction of early peoples to the sky or heaven powers. This simple social reaction to friendly nature powers is probably as early as any other form of religion, though it is hardly monotheism. Group ceremonies related to the imperative needs of living may be equally early. So also may be the reaction to the superusual, the "mana" reaction. The quest for a single origin and a law of unilinear development may have come to an end.

Careful studies of preliterate peoples have been made in every section of the world during the period. These may now be compared with the reports of missionaries or travelers of past centuries among the same peoples. In addition to the special studies listed above, intensive work has been done on mythology,[20] magic,[21] mana,[22] secret societies,[23] and social organization.[24] Most valuable has been the achievement of the ethnologists in delimiting cultural areas.[25] The American group

[20] Gray, editor, *Mythology of all Races* (1916——).

[21] Skeat, *Malay Magic* (1900); Fossey, *La Magie Assyrienne* (1902); Henry, *La Magie dans l'Inde antique* (1904); Thompson, *Semitic Magic* (1908); Budge, *Egyptian Magic* (1901); Moret, *La magie dans l'Egypte ancienne* (1907); Hubert et Mauss, "Ésquisse d'une théorie génerale de la magie," *Année Sociologique,* 1902–3.

[22] Karutz, "Der Emanismus," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* (1913), pp. 545–611; Lehmann, *Mana* (1922); Goldenweiser, "Spirit, Mana, and the Religious Thrill," *Jour. of Philos.,* 1915, pp. 632–40.

[23] Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies* (1908); Van Gennep, *Les Rites de passage* (1909).

[24] Lowie, *Primitive Society* (1920); Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization* (1922), pp. 235–91; Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organization* (1914).

[25] Wissler, *The American Indian* (1917, 2d ed. 1922); Reports, Bureau of American Ethnology; Eliot Smith, *Migrations of Early Culture* (1915); Schmidt und Koppers, *Völker und Kulturen* (1914——); Rivers, *History of Melanesian Society* (2v., 1914).

has been more cautious than the English or the German. Their work forecasts the possibility of carrying scientific history into the study of early religions, making the very necessary check and complement for the psychological technique.

In Egypt, archaeological research has brought to light deeper levels of antiquity, new texts of various periods, and tomb furnishings of unexpected informational possibilities. In addition to scores of monographs on funerary texts (Budge, Naville), gods (Sethe, Allen, Budge, Boylan, Murray), medicine (Wreszinski), ethics (Baillet), the period has given collections of texts,[26] histories of Egypt,[27] and of the Egyptian religion[28] supplementing the earlier work of Maspero, Erman, and Petrie.

Babylonia, Assyria, and the adjacent empires, as they emerge more completely to view create new problems. The pan-Babylonian theory (Winckler, Jeremias) and the pan-Egyptian theory (Eliot Smith, Perry) have lost support. Controversy centers temporarily on the place of the Amorites, whose importance and priority in the Semitic world are argued by Clay and denied by Barton.[29] The discovery of the Hammurabi code at the beginning of the century revealed the advanced civilization of the capital of his empire. New findings of archaeology in Phoenicia, in North Syria, and the interpretation of the Hittite writing by Hronzý (1915) advance the

[26] Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (5v., 1906–7).

[27] Breasted, *History of Egypt* (1906, new ed. 1921); Wiedemann, *Das Alte Aegypten* (1920).

[28] Steindorf, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (1905); Foucart, *Histoire des Religions et méthode comparative* (1912); Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1912); Erman, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. trans. 1907).

[29] Clay, *Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites* (1909), *The Empire of the Amorites* (1919), *The Antiquity of the Amorites* (1924); Barton, "The Place of the Amorites in the Civilization of Western Asia," *Jour. Amer. Oriental Society*, XLV, 1–38; reply by Clay, pp. 119–51.

reconstruction of the relations of peoples in this area. The Sumero-Akkadian inscriptions have been made available in translation, beginning in 1905.[30] The Tammuz cycle has been presented by Zimmern, Jastrow, and Langdon.[31] In the history of the religions Professor Jastrow's works[32] stand almost alone.

The place of most importance in the Moslem field must be given to a work of co-operative scholarship, the *Encyclopedia of Islam,* appearing since 1908 in three languages, English, French, and German. The most outstanding individual achievement is the great collection of source-material in the *Annali dell'Islam* (8v., 1905–18), by Prince Caetani. Knowledge of every phase of this religion has been advanced. The conditions of pre-Moslem Arabia, the relations of Jews, Christians, and Arabs before Mohammed, the life of the prophet, the making of the Koran, the nature of the Hadith, the political development, law, ethics, theology, the sects and the mystics have all been subjects of special research with the result that Islam appears in a very different character after twenty-five years.[33] Many general studies of the religion[34] have been

[30] Thureau-Dangin, *Les inscriptions de Sumer et d'Akkad* (1905).

[31] Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar* (1914).

[32] *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens* (1905–12); *Aspects of Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria* (1911).

[33] Noeldeke, "Arabs (Ancient)," *E.R.E.*; Margoliouth, *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam* (1905); Guidi, *L'Arabie antéislamique* (1921); Dussaud, *Les Arabes en Syrie avant de l'Islam* (1907); Lammens, *Le Berceau de l'Islam* (1914); Philby, *The Heart of Arabia* (1922); Huart, *Histoire des Arabes* (2v., 1921–23); Goldziher, *Vorlesung über den Islam* (1910, 2d ed. 1925, Eng. trans.); Guillaume, *The Traditions of Islam* (1924); Lammens, "Qoran et Tradition," *Récherches de Sc. Rel.* (1910); Wellhausen, *Das Arabische Reich und seine Sturz* (1902); Andrae, *Die Person Muhammeds* (1917); Nicholson, *The Mystics of Islam* (1914), *The Idea of Personality in Sufism* (1923); Bauer, *Islamische Ethik* (3v., 1916–22); Browne, *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion* (1918); Walter, *The Ahmadiya Movement* (1922); Mez, *Die Renaissance des Islams* (1922).

[34] Macdonald, *The Religious Life and Attitude in Islam* (1909), *Aspects of Islam* (1911); Hurgronji, *Mohammedanism* (1916); Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam* (1913).

made in addition to the important works of Goldziher and Margoliouth. The importance of Islam in the modern world has given rise to special studies and made regional knowledge imperative. Notable among these are the works of Hurgronji, André, and Crooke.[35]

Central Asia has assumed a place of primary importance during recent years. Exploration by Klementz, Stein, Gruenwedel, Le Coq, and Pelliot has revealed a complex mixture of cultures and religions and thrown new light on Buddhism and Manichaeism. Many problems may find solution there.

Earlier work on Iranian religion has been continued by a brilliant array of scholars.[36] The texts have been subjected to criticism. The date of Zarathustra appears to be settled in confirmation of the Persian tradition, 660–583 B. C. (Jackson, West, Casartelli, Meillet), though Moulton and Bartholomae still prefer an earlier date. The Gatha texts are separated definitely as belonging to the Zoroastrian reform and the religion of the prophet stands apart from the earlier folk religion and the later state cult. Special work has been done on the theology (Dhalla), on philosophy (Casartelli), on Manichaeism (Cumont, Le Coq, Jackson).

Great advance was made in the understanding of the Graeco-Roman religions when attention turned from mythology and the philosophic literature to a study of the cult and the regional differences. Philology yielded priority to ethnology and sociology. Archaeology has revealed the pre-Hellenic

[35] Hurgronji, *The Achehnese* (2v. 1906); André, *Islam et les Races* (2v. 1923), *L'Islam Noir* (1924); Crooke, *Herklot's, Islam in India* (with additions, 1921).

[36] Jackson, *Zoroaster the Prophet of Ancient Iran* (1899); Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism* (1913); Pettazzoni, *La Religione di Zarathustra* (1920); Mistri, *Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism* (1907); Sanjana, *Zarathustra and Zarathustrianism in the Avesta* (1907); Bartholomae, *Zarathustra, Leben und Lehre* (1924); Meillet, *Trois Conférences sur les Gatha de l'Avesta* (1925); Dhalla, *Zoroastrian Theology* (1914); Cumont et Kugener, *Récherches sur le Manichéisme* (1908–12).

Aegean religion, of which tentative sketches have appeared. Semitic influence on early Greece now seems to be less than was formerly supposed. The great work of Farnell on the cults has been completed and supplemented by a study of the ideas of immortality. There have been several brilliant interpretations of Greek religion. Important special studies have been made of the festivals, the gods, the oracles, and of folklore.[37] The division of Roman religious development into its historic stages and its separation from the covering veil of Greek influence was the work of the new century. Credit for a new orientation in the study goes to Wissowa. The Etruscan religion and influence still remain obscure. A vast amount of research has been devoted to the religions of the empire and the nature and spread of the Mystery Cults.[38]

Any attempt to make a skeleton sketch of the advance in the last twenty-five years in the knowledge of Indian religion and culture must be unsatisfactory. Several histories of India have appeared, the latest being a work of collaboration, *The*

[37] Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (5v. 1896–1909); *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (1921); Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* (1925); Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (1903); *Themis* (1908); Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought* (1923); Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (1912); Nilsson, *Griechischen Festen* (1906); Evans, "The Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult," *Jour. of Hellenic Studies,* 1901; Glotz, *Les civilizations préhellenique* (1914); Cook, *Zeus* (1914); Kern, *Orpheus* (1920); Hogarth, "Aegean Religion," *E.R.E.*; Dempsey, *The Delphic Oracle* (1918); Otto, *Die Manen* (1920); Foucart, *Les Mystères d'Éleusis* (1920); Abbot, *Macedonian Folklore* (1903); Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion* (1910).

[38] Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (1902, 2d ed. 1912); Herbig, "Etruscan Religion," *E.R.E.*; Carter, *The Religion of Numa* (1906); Fowler, *Roman Ideas of Deity* (1914), *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (1911); Toutain, *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain* (1907–11); Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (1911); *The Mysteries of Mithra* (1903); Graillot, *Le culte de Cybele* (1912–16); Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (1904); Geffcken, *Der Ausgang der Griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (1920).

Cambridge History of India, 1922. The history of the literature has been written in France, Germany, and England. Archaeology at Mohen-jo-daro and Harappa suggest an entire revision of earlier ideas of the culture of pre-Aryan India. Ethnographic studies have been made in great detail by Crooke, Risley, Rose, Thurston, and Baines, including a survey of castes. All phases of the religious history and the far-spread ramification of sects have found interpreters, notable among whom now are native Hindu scholars. These studies include the Indo-European origins, the pre-Aryan religions, the Vedic age, the philosophic movements, Buddhism, Jainism, the Ajivikas, the great divisions of Hinduism represented in Vaishnavite, Saivite, and Shakta cults, the Sikhs, and modern movements of reform. Special works have been devoted to the great religious philosophers and leaders of religion, to the communal and family rites, the development of the theology and ethics. A great deal of this work has been done under the editorship of Farquhar in the three important series, "The Heritage of India," "The Religious Life of India," and "The Religious Quest of India." Unfortunately they frequently carry an apologetic cast.[89]

[89] Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur* (3v. 1908–20); Farquhar, *Outline of Religious Literature of India* (1920); Chatterji, "Dravidian Origins and the Beginnings of Indian Civilization," *Modern Review* December 1924; Risley, *The People of India* (1908); Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of S. India* (7v. 1909); Rose, *A Glossary of Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and N. W. Frontier Province* (3v. 1911–19); Schrader, "Aryan Religion," *E.R.E.*; von Schroeder, *Arische Religion* (2v. 1914, 1916); Bender, *The Home of the Indo-Europeans* (1922); Hirt, *Die Indogermanen* (2v. 1905–7); Carnoy, *Les Indoeuropéens* (1921); Bloomfield, *The Religion of the Veda* (1908); Griswold, *The Religion of the Veda* (1925); Oltramare, *Histoire des idées théosophiques dans l'Inde,* Vol. I, *La théosophie brahmanique* (1907), Vol. II, *La théosophie bouddhique* (1923); de la Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme* (1909); Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India* (1903); Stcherbatsky, *The Central Concept of Buddhism* (1923); Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy* (1923), *The Karma Mimansa* (1921), *The Sankhya System* (1918); Jaini, *Outlines of Jainism* (1916); Stevenson, *The Heart of*

The nearest approach to a comprehensive history of Buddhism is Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism* (3v., 1921). Research has gone steadily forward in all lands. The list of scholars at work in India alone is inspiring. The rise of the new way of life in the midst of Hinduism, the life of Gautama, the development of the *sangha* and of the sects of the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna, the relationships of the Pali and Sanskrit canons, the origins of the Buddhist monachism, the development of Tantrism, and the absorption of Buddhism in Hinduism have been critically treated by many scholars during the last decade. The records of the Chinese pilgrims, the nature of the missionary activity in China, the adjustment to Chinese social ideals, the influence of Buddhism on the folk religion, and its relations with classical Confucianism have been studied and reported. The story of Buddhism in Central Asia and Tibet remains uncertain. The external facts of the religion have been brought to light but the blend of the new faith with the earlier Bon cult of Tibet awaits interpretation. Korean Buddhism also has been almost neglected. The Buddhism of Japan in all its many forms has been presented by both native and foreign scholars. Perhaps the most significant result of Buddhist research is the convincing evidence of the control of social and environmental conditions in transforming a religion.[40]

Jainism (1915); Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads* (1921); Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy* (Vol. I, 1922); Barnett, *Hinduism* (1906); Das Gupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy* (Vol. I, 1922); Macauliffe, *The Sikh Religion* (6v. 1909); Field, *The Religion of the Sikhs* (1914); Macnicol, *Indian Theism* (1915); Woodroffe (Arthur Avalon), *Shakti and Shakta* (1920); Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India* (1915); Sastri, *History of the Brahmo Samaj* (1911–12); Rai, *The Arya Samaj* (1915); McKenzie, *Hindu Ethics* (1922).

[40] Vasu, *Modern Buddhism and Its Followers in Orissa* (1911); Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism* (1924); Hackmann, *Buddhism As a Religion* (1910); C. A. F. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Psychology* (1914); Stcherbatsky, *The Soul Theory of the*

The separation of the strands of native and foreign religions in China, the critical evaluation of the sacred books as historic material, the ethnological study of the races mingling to produce the religions and cultures of the historic period are achievements of this century. When the religious philosophy of the intellectuals of Taoism and Confucianism was separated from the religious customs and ideas of the people many problems dropped away. The influence of Taoism and Buddhism on each other as popular religions and of Buddhist philosophy on the later Confucian thinkers is now clear. Since the social history of China has been revealed the rise of the early religious philosophies and the reasons for the success of Buddhism are easier to understand. Special work has been done on the texts of Taoism by Father Wieger and on the popular customs by Doré. The philosophic writings of the important thinkers and social reformers are now available at least in part in one of the modern languages of Europe, and a history of the philosophy by Liang Che-Chiao is announced.[41]

Buddhists (1920); Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (1907); McGovern, *Introduction to Mahāyāna Buddhism* (1922); Getty, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism* (1914); Saunders, *Gotama Buddha* (1920); *Epochs in Buddhist History* (1924); Johnston, *Buddhist China* (1913); De Visser, *The Arhats in China and Japan* (1923); Hackmann, *Laien-Buddhismus* in China (1924); Grünwedel, "Lamaismus," *Kultur der Gegenwart* (1906); Starr, *Korean Buddhism* (1918); Reischauer, *Studies in Japanese Buddhism* (1917); Haas, *Die Sekten des japanischen Buddhismus* (1905); Anesaki, *Nichiren, a Buddhist Prophet* (1916); Okusa, *Principal Teachings of the True Sect of the Pure Land* (1910).

[41] Wieger, *La Chine à travers les âges* (1920); Cordier, *Histoire génerale de la Chine* (1920); Ross, *The Original Religion of China* (1909); Douglas, *Confucianism and Taoism* (1900); De Groot, *Religion in China* (1912); Parker, *Religion in China* (1905); Wieger, *Histoire des croyances religieuses et des opinions philosophiques en Chine* (1917); Granet, *La Religion des Chinois* (1922); Chavannes, *Le T'ai Chan* (1910); Wieger, *Taoism (2v.* 1911, 1913); Doré, *Recherches sur les superstitions en Chine* (7v. 1911–12, Eng. trans. 1914); Giles, *A History of Chinese Literature* (1901); Liang Che-Chiao, *Development of Chinese Thought.*

The ancient religion of Japan, submerged for a millenium and a half by Buddhism, was revived as the national religion in the middle of last century. The task of scholarship has been to recover the primitive religion apart from the rationalization and secularization of it in the modern period. The criticism of the texts of the Kojiki and Nihonji has begun. Revon has shown the nature of the Norito as spoken charms. Studies of the many sects of Shinto have been made and reported, for the most part in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan.* Several scholars have attempted to penetrate to the early religion by way of the mythologies. More promising studies depend upon ethnological and geographic data. The most interesting phase of the study of the religions of Japan centers in the transformation of Confucianism and Buddhism by the Japanese social attitudes and the secularization of Shinto in recent years.[42]

The work of twenty-five years,[43] seen ever so superficially, is impressive. Valuable as it has been, great areas of facts, patiently won, remain mere dead materials without a soul. That they do not come to life is due to the fact that the history of religions has only slowly been groping its way toward a scientific method.

[42] Florenz, *Geschichte der japanischen Literatur* (1906); Brinkley, *A History of the Japanese People* (1905); Munro, *Prehistoric Japan* (1908); Knox, *The Development of Religion in Japan* (1907); Aston, *Shinto, the Ancient Religion of Japan* (1907); Revon, *Le Shintoisme* (1907); Haas, *Religion der Japaner* (1914); Erskine, *Japanese Customs* (1925); Hearn, *Japan, an Attempt at Interpretation* (1905); Schurhammer, *Shinto, der Weg der Götter in Japan* (1923) (a treatment of Shinto from the records of the missionaries of the 16th and 17th centuries); Nukariya, *The Religion of the Samurai* (1913); Nitobe, *Bushido* (1905); Chamberlain, *The Invention of a New Religion* (1912); Holtom, *The Political Philosophy of Modern Shinto* (1922).

[43] No references are made to the religions of Israel, Judaism, or Christianity, since these are to be dealt with in separate articles in this series.

II

The troubled experience of two decades has convinced historians that no single science is able to give a descriptive interpretation of the materials of religion. Religion, however defined, is a function of human life. From the beginnings in the shadows of the prehistoric to the most complex culture religions it is woven into all phases of the moving life-process and can be understood only as the network of relations in the social milieu of all the centuries is brought to light. In the most conservative statement it may be said that in the so-called primitive ages groups of human beings found it necessary to win the satisfactions of the needs of life from the natural environment. Food, shelter, sex, security in the presence of the dangers of nature and hostile animals and men had to be won and the way these values were attained was conditioned by the geographic environment and the nature of man in society. For guidance here the historian must depend upon geography, paleogeography perhaps, and social psychology. Unfortunately groups do not remain in the original geographic milieu. To trace migrations, the drift of cultures, the mingling of peoples, to escape the errors of identifying language with race or race with culture, to check common, original sources of widely separated and altered cults, gods, and languages, to determine the paths of the spread of cults—these problems call for the aid not only of geography but of physical anthropology, ethnology, archaeology, and linguistics. For the religions of higher culture the dependence upon the allied sciences is equally evident. One thing at least the last generation has learned in regard to religions; they are in constant process of change in dependence upon the changes in social situation, the advance of practical technique, and the enlarged understand-

ing of the world. The method of history of religions is no longer the simple historical method used by the founders of the science before the opening century; it is an aggregate of all the sciences whose domains cover data which the historian must use. The success of history therefore depends upon the adequacy of the methods and findings of the various sciences involved. During the last twenty-five years these allied sciences have been struggling for a satisfactory method. The materials of religion often held the primary place. The story of these various methodological drifts is also the story of method in the history of religions.[44]

Methods crumbled easily a generation ago. In 1884, as the recognized master of the method of comparative philology, Max Müller warned against the "dabblers" who attempted to interpret religions without the necessary equip-

[44] Some of the works which deal with method and the conflict of methods are: H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., *L'Étude comparée des religions,* Vol. II, *Ses Methodes* (1925); F. Schleiter, *Religion and Culture* (1919); O. Schrader, "Aryan Religion," *E.R.E.,* II, 12–15; J. Toutain, *Études de mythologie et d'histoire des religions* (1909); L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion, Its Method and Scope* (1908); Goblet d'Alviella, *Croyances, Rites, Institutions* (1911), II, 93–108; 211–15; 364–94; G. Foucart, *Histoire des religions et méthode comparative* (1912), pp. i–clxiv; R. Pettazzoni, *Svoglimento e carattere della storia della religioni* (1924); F. Boas, "The Limitations of the Comparative Method of Anthropology," *Science* (N.S.), IV (1896), 901–8; Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man* (1911); Boas, "The Methods of Ethnology," *Amer. Anthropol.,* XXII (1920), 311–21; J. Dewey, "The Interpretation of Savage Mind," *Psychological Review,* IX (1902), 217–30; E. Faris, "Are Instincts Data or Hypotheses," *Amer. Jour. of Sociol.* September, 1921; R. H. Lowie, "On the Principle of Convergence in Ethnology," *Jour. of Amer. Folklore,* XXV (1912), 24–32; Fr. Graebner, *Methode der Ethnologie* (1911); W. Wundt, *Probleme der Völkerpsychologie* (1911); E. Durkheim, *Les régles de la méthode sociologique* (1895); W. I. Thomas, *The Polish Peasant* (1918–20), I, 1–86; John Dewey, "The Need for Social Psychology," *Psychological Review,* XXIV (1917), 266–77; Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct* (1922); S. J. Case, "The Historical Study of Religion," *Journal of Religion,* I (1921), 1–17; G. B. Smith (editor), *A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion* (1916); H. E. Barnes (editor), *The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences* (1925).

ment; at the beginning of the century Oldenberg smilingly referred to the work of Müller and his colleagues as belonging to "the heroic age of linguistics." Others spoke of it as the "Vedic madness." Using philology to reconstruct the common elements of the original religion of the Indo-Europeans, they found themselves totally unable to agree. Philology sharpened its tools, formulated strict rules for tracing the change of form and meanings of words and discovering the meaning of the original roots. When reduced in this way, however, it discovered that life and concrete body could be added only by appeal to ethnology. Comparative linguistics serves now to determine the common origin of peoples, to restore elements of the common heritage, and then turns the task of completing the picture over to other hands. Comparative mythology, after years of disrespect because of its extravagances, has returned to the field, adopted the critical rules of linguistics and ethnology, and begins to serve in tracing the original form of a far-diffused myth which then the sociologist may trace in its transformation in each separate development.[45]

Anthropology early entered upon the task of determining the origin and the law of development of religion. Convinced that the law of biological evolution had its analogue in the social realm, anthropologists studied primitive peoples. After collecting data from all parts of the earth they arranged them in the order of complexity. The determination of what was simplest was settled on purely subjective grounds according to the psychology of the student and the order of development selected was equally subjective. This comparative and psychological method met the same difficulty that the philologists had faced. There was no agreement as to what was the ulti-

[45] Dumézil, *Le Festin d'Immortalité* (1924).

mate beginning and no consensus as to arrangement. There was at once a protest against the violent abstracting of a fact from the milieu in which alone it had meaning and equating it with another fact also stripped of its rich significance. More careful study of preliterate peoples showed also that this supposed evolutionary development did not correspond with the recognized facts of the various groups. Anthropology realized the necessity of becoming history in the strict sense. Instead of assuming a uniform evolution anthropology now takes complexity for granted and tries to recover the facts in regard to the various types of culture. It carefully restores the types and delimits the cultural and marginal areas. Goldenweiser summarizes the "catechism" of the new anthropology: "The concentration of research upon restricted geographical-historical districts which are studied in their chronological depth and their lateral geographical extension in intertribal contact; the application of the objective and statistical methods in tracing of distribution of features or feature complexes and of the psychological method in the study of the association, interpenetration and assimilation of features; the use of the concepts of 'style' and 'pattern' in the description of tribal or area cultures especially in their relation to absorption of new traits of local or foreign origin; the extension of the differential method inside of tribal boundaries to subtribal and individual differences; the adoption of the linguistic method wherever authenticity or delicate shades of meaning or evaluation are involved; the disentangling of the historical and psychological ingredients of cultural complexes; the rejection of evolution and environmentalism in their crude classical forms and the application of the concepts 'diffusion,' 'independent development,' 'parallelism,' 'convergence' not as

dogmatic postulates but as heuristic tools."[46] Anthropology thus has sought to build a method free from presupposition and subjectivity, using the methods of other sciences where the materials demand it.

The comparative method, common to the social sciences, has been shorn of its extravagances. It is a different tool, with requirements of different checks, according to the differences of materials compared. The social fact is no longer torn from its organic setting, nor stripped of its peculiar meaning in that setting. This very richness of individual detail is the most important thing about it and the main test of borrowing and of convergence. Used in the realm of religious data, especially where psychical phenomena are concerned, the comparative method is a peculiarly delicate and risky tool. It is never used as in earlier days to fill gaps in obscure areas or to give an immediate interpretation in another field of materials. The individuality of the group is respected. Comparison helps to clarify, to suggest the line of search for revealing materials, to uncover unseen data by contrast or analogy, to trace borrowings, and under strict control to detect a common heritage.

Psychology as an aid to the history of religions has had a great variety of forms. Early it discarded "the faculty of faith," "the religious sentiment," "the religious consciousness," "the religious instinct." Man as religious was found to be simply man behaving in a certain social way. The questionnaire and statistical method of the pioneer psychologists of religion as well as the treatment of religion as a pathological condition were seen to be inadequate. The study of types yielded results that promised help in understanding great individuals until the rise of the sociological schools turned atten-

[46] *The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences*, p. 247.

tion in another direction. Both the *Völkerpsychologie* of Wundt and the sociological school of Durkheim started with the group. Religion was interpreted as a product of society, and its form and meaning sought in an interpretation of the nature of group control. While both these schools, under the influence of the new ethnology, were forced out of their evolutionary theories and were forced to accept the possibility of complex origins, they did establish the primary importance of the group for primitivity. Cooley carried the principle of social control into a phase which forbids a return to the old lines of individual psychology. With functional psychology and behaviorism the concern with instinct yielded to a study of habits, wishes, and attitudes. Social psychology now, under the stimulus of McDougall, Mead, Faris, Dewey, and others, is seeking the key to the formation of the self, the nature of personality, the how of thinking, and the interaction of the whole natural and social milieu and the individual unit. Other phases of psychological method are represented in the psychoanalytical approach of Freud and the study of crowd psychology. There is also, in Germany and America, a new type of case study with elaborate control checks which combined with social psychology may prove valuable to the student of religions.

The history of religions inherited the historical method built in the conflicts of the early nineteenth century by Otfreid Müller. In 1908 Jean Réville[47] spoke in the name of the science of religion claiming allegiance to it. At the International Congress of Religions at Oxford, Toutain set this strict and rigorous method over against the method of the anthropologists—a rigid exclusion of all a priori and a refusal of all hasty

[47] *Les phases successives de l'histoire des religions,* pp. 225–40.

generalizations; careful and minute criticism and analysis of sources; conscientious search for every fact which might clarify the data; detailed studies before reconstruction of the whole; immersion of the mind in the whole milieu of the time and place studied; and in order better to understand the soul and life of the people in which one's special interest lies, a careful attention to the study of the parallel history of other peoples.[48] History of religions is, however, no longer history in the sense of twenty years ago. The materials are part of a living, changing, social process and can be ensouled only by the fact-finding, critical, and interpretative aid of a score of methods belonging to other sciences. It is no longer a criticism and interpretation of texts nor the elaboration of a detached and selected portion of historic material, but a revivification of the materials by a reconstruction of the relations of the social situations by the aid of geography, physical anthropology, ethnology, archaeology, linguistics, social psychology, and the other social sciences. The general history of religions has long required the collaboration of specialists in the various religions. It may be that the history of a single religion will now require the collaboration of specialists in the allied sciences. It will be more difficult but it will be a living history. Out of it may come also, at last, an understanding of the meaning of religion.

III

What is religion? It is a universal phenomenon yet so elusive that among special students of religion there have been literally hundreds of discordant definitions. Some have concluded that it cannot be defined. Nevertheless the last twenty-five years have brought some clarification, partly because of a

[48] *The Third International Congress of the History of Religions,* Vol. II, pp. 121 f.

better knowledge of religions, partly because of the new scientific approach.

Nowhere is the insinuation of the a priori so subtle as in the study of religion. Scientists have written books on religion, assuming, and therefore discovering, that the differentia of religion is supernaturalism. All forms of subjective bias, preoccupation with a special field of materials, limitation to a special method, are revealed in the definitions. More important is the unconscious bias of a cultural milieu. Since almost all the early writers on history of religions belong to the Western world where for centuries religion has been focused by authority on "truth" or "belief" regarding a supernatural world, it was natural that their definitions should have that emphasis. Though definitions in terms of the specific Christian truths were soon abandoned the influence of the philosophic reconstructions of Kant, Hegel, and Schleiermacher remained. While religion might no longer be "revelation," nor even "primitive revelation," it was often an intellectual apprehension of God," an "apprehension of the infinite," an "emotional attitude" toward the divine. In its most reduced form it was "belief in spiritual beings" or an appreciation of and reaction to the extraordinary or the mysterious. Always the center of religion was the supernatural. When faced with religions whose emphasis is altogether in the human realm, and where gods figure little or not at all, the answer was that these were ethical systems, not religions. It was an easy answer, too easy. In any other realm science would have demanded a new analysis to account for the facts.

A shift in emphasis came when attention turned to the origin of group customs and the ceremonial, to what was done rather than what was thought, in early religious groups. The

great complex of religio-magical ceremonies of the public cult were agreed to be religious and as the control of the group was recognized the center of religion tended to fall in these public ways of securing and guaranteeing the values of life. Religion certainly included a group technique of control of, and adjustment to, the known and unknown environment, the human and the superhuman, to secure the satisfactions of human needs. Definitions then were formed to combine beliefs and practices with the emphasis on the practices. At this point sociological studies of the origin and evolution of moral ideas, of ideas of the supernatural, of the development of practical science to replace the old magical method of control, confirmed the idea that the social mind was the mold in which were shaped all ideas of the divine and that when a new technique was found the old ways of dealing with the supernatural could be discarded. It was necessary, then, either to drop to a deeper level in the definition of religion or to look forward to the disappearance of religion altogether. Reinach, with his usual frankness, took the latter way. Other scholars turned again to the facts. They found that while the supernatural was not a fixed thing and the ceremonial and rite also were in constant process of change or decay, there always remained the interest in certain central values common to the group. Religion was redefined as "faith in the conservation of values" or "consciousness of highest social values."

When the religions of the world and of the ages were reviewed in this light it appeared that the "values" varied with the periods and the peoples but nevertheless were always practical or ideal satisfactions of the socially approved needs and aspirations of human life. The differentia of religion then is in the shared quest for completely satisfying life. If religion

is to be defined for science the search of a quarter-century settles for the present at least upon this central characteristic. All other elements of the religious complex have changed continuously owing to increasing knowledge of the nature of the universe, more effective practical control, and an ever higher ideal of social, spiritual values. The task of history of religions is the descriptive interpretation of the ever changing embodiment of the unchanging quest.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THEODORE GERALD SOARES

Religious education as a scientific study belongs to this century. The term was scarcely used twenty-five years ago. There was no college, university, or theological seminary giving instruction in the subject. While there was a large popular literature on Sunday-school methods, teacher training, plans of lesson teaching, and the like, there was not a single book that dealt in any significant and scientific manner with the developing religious experience of childhood and youth, and with the educational processes by which such experience could be promoted. The first book that in any sense outlined the problem appeared in 1900—*Principles of Religious Education,* by Nicholas Murray Butler.

There were, however, three important movements at the end of the last century which constituted a basis for the development of religious education. The first was the popular interest in the scientific study of the Bible. The publication of *The Old and New Testament Student* was the means of leading thousands of ministers to an understanding of the historical method in the study of a literature which had been to many of them a mere storehouse of texts. Already in 1890 the Blakeslee Lessons (afterward the Bible Study Union Lessons) had provided for Sunday schools a method of serious, though it seems to us today very dry and academic, study of the biblical material. The homiletic method which had so largely obtained in Sunday-school teaching was beginning to give place to a scholastic method. In the minds of most progressive re-

ligious educators the correct achievement of biblical knowledge was the main desideratum. Of course it was always understood that it should be practically applied, but it was expected that correct knowledge would naturally lead to correct application.

The second interest making for a new religious education at the close of the last century was the Child Study Movement, of which G. Stanley Hall was the conspicuous leader. The center of educational interest was to be shifted from the material of the curriculum to the needs and interests of the child. A new interest in genetic psychology developed and elaborate questionnaires were sent out to parents, teachers, and others associated with children to discover the "characteristics" of each period of child development. The emphasis of this new study was upon the reform of general education, but it had a vital influence upon the teaching of religion.

A third factor that was to have the most far-reaching effect in the new science of religious education was the development of the social character of the educational process. John Dewey had been experimenting at Chicago in the formation of children into a society to learn the meaning of life by engaging in some of the primitive processes of living, such as weaving, spinning, cooking, and the like, allowing the intellectual interests to arise naturally from these activities. In 1899 he published *School and Society,* a book little noted by teachers of religion at the time, but containing the germ of most of the developments of the next quarter-century. This was followed in 1902 by *The Child and the Curriculum.*

But at the beginning of the century Dewey had little influence in the religious field. It was the first two movements discussed above that were most determinative. Taken together they produced the interest in the graded Bible curricu-

lum, which was the early aim of religious education. Irving King's *Psychology of Child Development* (1903), Kirkpatrick's *Fundamentals of Child Study* (1903), and especially G. Stanley Hall's *Adolescence* (1904), were the bases for an examination of the Bible to find the various elements that would fit each age of child development. It was thought that certain interests emerged as the child progressed, and that these interests could be met by correspondent biblical material. G. Stanley Hall gave a great vogue to the recapitulation theory and its pedagogical correlate, the culture-epochs theory, and made a plea for the Old Testament as preferable for children because they were recapitulating the child experience of the race. This theory dominated the more popular books, such as *The Boy Problem* by Forbush (1907). Significant attempts to outline a Bible curriculum were Haslett, *The Pedagogical Bible School* (1903) and Pease, *Outline of a Bible School Curriculum* (1906). The preparation of a series of textbooks was undertaken by Harper and Burton under the general title of "Constructive Bible Studies."

An interesting indication of the development of material for the youngest children is seen in a comparison of the Preface of the first edition of the initial volume in the "Constructive Series," Ferris, *The Kindergarten in the Sunday School,* with the Preface to the latest revision (1925). In the former an apology is offered for the use of stories from outside the Bible on the ground that they came nearer to the experience of the child. In the latter, a preface to exactly the same book, the explanation offered is for the use of Bible stories at all for such young children, on the ground that contrary to some present opinions, there is some material in the Bible that is within the kindergarten experience.

During the first years of the century there was vigorous

discussion of the graded curriculum of Bible study, many contending vehemently for a uniform lesson for all ages, insisting that the pedagogy should be graded but not the sacred material. However, in 1908 the International Sunday-School Convention authorized its Lesson Committee to prepare a completely graded series. The findings of genetic psychology were utilized as the basis of this study and the idea of graded lessons became established.

Meantime another scientific interest was having its effect on religious education. Psychology of religion was a very young study at the beginning of the century. Some early essays in this field had appeared in the *American Journal of Psychology*. Such were Daniels, "The New Life: A Study in Regeneration," VI (1895), 61–103; Leuba, "Studies in the Psychology of Religious Phenomena," VII (1896), 309–85. The first book with the title *Psychology of Religion* was that of Starbuck in 1899. This was followed by Coe, *The Spiritual Life,* in 1900. These were largely studies of the phenomena of conversion and of religious feeling. The authors were seeking to discover the nature of the religious experience of converts. They reached some very significant conclusions regarding normal and abnormal religious development in adolescence.[1]

In 1903 the Religious Education Association was formed. Its volumes of proceedings contained papers from the leading educators and religious workers of the country. There is to be found in these papers a profound dissatisfaction with the current moral and religious training of the young, a sense that

[1] Other writers in psychology of religion who contributed during this first decade to an understanding of the problems of religious education were Granger, *The Soul of a Christian* (1900), William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902), Davenport, *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals* (1905), Pratt, *Psychology of Religious Belief* (1905), Ames, *Psychology of Religious Experience* (1910).

the church was lagging behind the school in method and understanding, and an insistence that the responsibility of all social institutions in character training must be seriously faced anew.

The first book to gather up the contributions from all these fields and show their meaning was Coe, *Education in Religion and Morals* (1904). It was a protest against any mere intellectual conception of education and a presentation of the development of persons as the aim of the educational process. While the recapitulation theory was still employed and a theory of some original "religious impulse" was developed, the main stress of the book was upon growth through enlarging social experience. The social note that had thus come into religious education was characteristic of a considerable literature.[2]

The first scientific course on religious education was given by Professor Charles R. Henderson at the University of Chicago in 1904. Later Professor Coe gave courses at Northwestern and Professor Starbuck at Leland Stanford. Probably the present writer was the first professor to have this subject as the name of his university chair, 1906. After this, numerous chairs were established in universities, colleges, and theological seminaries, until the subject has now attained a recognized status.

The problem of educational organization became important in the second decade of the century. The Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School had been reorganized by President Harper, who was for many years its superintendent. The plan of this organization and the educational principles which it in-

[2] Hoben, *The Minister and the Boy* (1912); Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang* (1912); Margaret Slattery, *The Girl and Her Religion* (1913), may be mentioned as typical.

volved were presented in Burton and Mathews, *Principles and Ideals for the Sunday School* (1903). The emphasis was still on a school, an institution primarily of instruction. The effort was to secure the proper grading of the pupils, the determination of fitting *biblical* material for each grade, the training of teachers, and in general the development of the Sunday-school in the respect of the children, the church, and the community. Henry F. Cope, who had become the secretary of the Religious Education Association, outlined these organizational needs in *The Modern Sunday School in Principle and Practice* (1907). H. H. Meyer followed with *The Graded Sunday School in Principle and Practice* (1916).

But it soon became evident that the problem of organization concerned more than the Sunday school. A host of other agencies were carrying on educational work in the church. Young People's Societies, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, various missionary societies, were active and all independent alike of one another and of the church. The Religious Education Association appointed a commission in 1912 on "The Correlation of Educational Agencies in the Local Church." Professor Walter S. Athearn was chairman of this commission. He subsequently developed his report and published the first comprehensive book on organization, *The Church School* (1914). Here was the beginning of the plan for a complete departmentalization of the church, each department correlating all the interests and activities of its members, week-day and Sunday.

The books on organization had given some significant discussion of worship. Very appropriately the Sunday school had not used this term. Opening and closing exercises were the expressions more fittingly describing what usually took

place. But the education of children in religion meant a natural development of those attitudes of reverence, gratitude, loyalty, which, with their appropriate expression, we have been accustomed to call worship. How do children worship? How far does the adult material suit their needs? What happens in their experience when they use hymns, prayers, Scriptures? What possibility is there of spontaneous expression of their religious feeling? These were questions calling for study and observation. In the Union School of Religion, Professor Hugh Hartshorne was facing these problems. His *Worship in the Sunday School* (1913) presented his conclusions, while his *Manual for Training in Worship* (1915, and a second volume 1919), gave his programs. Since then the study of worship has been very vital. We are only in the beginning of an understanding of the worship experience of children. It is a fruitful field for experimentation.[3]

A new interest developed in the second decade of the century in the relation of religious education to the public schools. Professor Squires, of the University of North Dakota, found that his students in English were unable to understand the simplest references to Scripture story or saying. After forty years of the uniform Sunday-school lesson we had a generation that knew less about the Bible than the people of older days. A scheme was devised for giving high-school credit for church Bible study. At the State Normal School at Greeley, Colorado, it was found that teachers of English were ignorant of the Bible, and a similar plan for credit was devised. The lengthened program of hours at Gary, Indiana, with various free periods, gave opportunity for the churches to hold Bible

[3] *Religious Education,* October, 1925, is devoted entirely to this subject and indicates the present position of studies and experiments.

classes on week days and to secure the attendance of the children. Other cities followed one or other of these examples.

The movement became so important and developed so many interesting problems that the Religious Education Association decided to make it the subject of their conference in 1916. The results were published in *Religious Education,* April and June, 1916. These results were not very definite. It was clear that some fairly good Bible study was going on and that a considerable number of children were receiving instruction, but the churches had not seen the educational significance of this opportunity. The Sunday-school leaders saw little more than an extra hour each week for the study of the same Sunday lesson, while the school authorities were by no means clear that the time was being profitably employed. The lack of competent teachers was especially evident.

But this movement was full of interest and promise. The Abingdon Press brought out a set of textbooks. At Malden, Massachusetts, Dean Walter S. Athearn developed a community training school for the preparation of teachers, and subsequently greatly enlarged The School of Religious Education and Social Service of Boston University, where leaders could be prepared for week-day as well as for all other branches of religious education. Whole communities organized for the conduct of this new work. In many cases a director of high educational fitness was chosen and a corps of teachers giving their full time to the various classes was developed. Community budgets often reached ten, twenty, and even thirty thousand dollars.

In 1921 the Religious Education Association decided again to study the problems of this week-day education. The services of Professor Erwin L. Shaver were secured to make a

survey of the work over the entire country. Many of the leaders in education and in religion were invited to prepare articles treating the fundamental principles involved. These were published in *Religious Education* for December, 1921, and February, 1922. The whole subject was considered at the Convention of 1922, and the findings published in the April and June issues of the magazine. These, together with the survey and an analysis of the problems that had appeared, were discussed by Cope in his two volumes, *The Week-Day Church School* (1921) and *Week-Day Religious Education* (1922). The most evident result of all this survey was that workers in the field were not clear about their educational aims, and were therefore naturally not very definite in their method. There was a great demand for satisfactory textbooks, but there was no agreement as to what the textbooks should seek to do. Was Bible study to be the main purpose of the week-day school; and if so, was the acquisition of Bible knowledge the end to be desired; and, if not, how was the Bible to be taught so as to secure any other end? Was the week hour to be devoted in part to worship; and, if so, how were the worship conditions to be secured, and what materials were to be used? Some thought that the week session should be devoted to study and the Sunday session to worship. The question of the correlation of the two sessions was felt to be especially difficult and important.

The week-day religious school developed serious administrative problems. Should a single church or a single denomination conduct a school; should it be a community enterprise; if so, should it be under the churches or under a separate council? Should the public-school authorities set any standards or exercise any supervision?

These and similar problems are still the subject of careful study. The leaders of week-day religious education have an association, which holds an annual meeting in connection with the convention of the Religious Education Association. Their discussions and findings have been published in the convention numbers of the magazine.

It has been noted above that the aims of religious education were found to be somewhat indefinite. There was general agreement that the objective was "character," "social living," "Christlikeness," etc., but it was not very clear what these involved. The war had caused much heart searching among religious educators. What does "the transmission of the cultural possessions of the race" mean if Christian nations are to destroy one another in war? In 1917 Coe brought out *A Social Theory of Religious Education.* He took his stand upon the social interpretation of Christianity. We say that we are seeking a Christian world order, a Christian industrial order. We have certain social and political programs toward those ends. But the more fundamental question arises, How shall we train our children so that they may bring about this Christian society? Evidently the educational process must itself be social and democratic. The children must be trained as critics of the social order in which they find themselves. Mere conformity to law and custom will not be enough, for laws are to be improved and customs are to be changed. He includes an evaluation of the educational methods of five ecclesiastical types with reference to their fitness for this new education.[4]

[4] The issues of *Religious Education* for 1917 contained many articles on education for the coming world order. The emphasis on democracy was evident in Winchester, *Religious Education and Democracy* (1917), Athearn, *Religious Education and American Democracy* (1917), Cope, *Education for Democracy* (1920).

These changing conceptions of religious education have raised anew the problem of curriculum. We have already noted how eager the week-day leaders were for material to be used in classes. Vigorous thinkers were offering them the baffling reply that they should not be concerned about material but about developing social experience.[5]

Professor Coe, in the book already quoted, laid down the principle that "a curriculum is not primarily a systematic set of ideas, but a progressive order of motives actually at work, actually fruiting here and now." The "materials" that have usually been considered primary become the means of illumination of the more fundamental educational process. He elaborated this view in "Opposing theories of the curriculum," *Religious Education* (April, 1922). Professor Joseph M. Artman in "Scientific Method as a Scheme for Evaluating Curricula," *Religious Education* (April, 1922), insists that the starting-point for curriculum is to be found in the "life situations" of the student. He calls the actual experience of the student the primary situation, while any experience in literature or history is a secondary situation. He criticizes most of the current textbooks as having the intellectual rather than the experiential interest.

This question of curriculum is now one of the most vital in religious education. We have moved a long way from the time when the contention was for scientific Bible study, and from the later time when the introduction of "extra-biblical" material was advocated. Both of these positions make Bible knowledge the real aim of religious education or, at best, the essential method, anything else being "extra."

[5] A. J. W. Myers, "A Critical Review of Current Lesson Material," *Religious Education* (August, 1917).

Betts, *The Curriculum of Religious Education* (1924), has endeavored to set up a threefold standard for religious material. It must contribute to the development of the fully functioning person (1) in all his own life-interests; (2) in the requirements that society makes upon him, and (3) in the demands of churchmanship. It is still insisted that there must be a certain balance between biblical and "extra-biblical" material.

The International Sunday School Lesson Committee has a standing subcommittee on curriculum, of which Professor W. C. Bower is chairman. This subcommittee, unlike the old Lesson Committee prior to 1914, is untrammeled by specific instructions and is set to discover with perfect freedom the means and methods to be employed in teaching religion. The subcommittee has issued a "Statement of a Theory of the Curriculum" (1924). Bower's own book, *The Curriculum of Religious Education* (1925), is just from the press. He lays emphasis on a changing human society in a world which man is in process of discovering, and indeed in a world which is itself in process of development. "The curriculum as a factor of direction becomes an instrument in the hands of the religious community for preparing persons to live religiously in a complex and rapidly changing world. The dynamic curriculum must be more than a follower of experience; it must anticipate experience and give it constructive direction." Religious education thus conceived becomes a creative effort for "building a social order founded upon spiritual ideals."

Is the curriculum carrying out what we have said we wanted to do? Dr. Adelaide T. Case, *Liberal Christianity and Religious Education* (1924), has made a study of the expressed or implied objectives of the liberal wing in the church and has

then raised the question, whether there has been developed an adequate educational procedure to attain these aims. She has come to the conclusion that current Protestant religious education is not "efficiently adapted to spread among the people either the ascertained knowledge, which is one factor of liberalism, or the religious attitudes and conduct that liberalism implies."

While these studies in curriculum have been going on, there has been an interesting development in the output of the publishers of textbooks.[6] It is in the nature of the case much easier to formulate principles of curriculum than to prepare actual books for class use. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that practice has somewhat lagged behind theory. Moreover publishers having salable textbooks on their hands are not quite ready to drop them from publication until they are convinced that there is something more salable to take their place.

An element in the curriculum problem is the new insistence upon the project principle. Manifestly if groups of young people are going to initiate their own religious enterprises and develop study interests growing out of these, they will not generally need the old type of textbook. Perhaps we shall repeat the educational slogan, "not textbooks but libraries." Children will not prepare lessons but look up facts and

[6] The University of Chicago Press which began with biblical studies has included a great range of titles, dealing with ethical problems, social service, dramatization, recreation, and specific educational projects. The latest title is *Right Living* by Maurice J. Neuberg, a study of ethical situations of young adolescents. The Beacon Press invited Professor Starbuck to outline for them a completely new curriculum, in which such books appear as *Living Together, God's Wonder World, Our Part in the World.* "Scribner's Completely Graded Series" includes *A Course for Beginners in Religious Education, Heroes of the Faith, Christian Life and Conduct.* The "Christian Nurture Series" includes *God's Great Family, The Christian Seasons, Church Worship and Membership.*

make investigations. Shaver has presented the possibilities of this "self-activity" in *The Project Principle in Religious Education* (1925), and has worked out a new type of study in conformity with the principle in *Young People's Problems* (1925).

The editors of the "Constructive Series" in their Preface to the 1925 edition of Burgess, *Life of Christ,* have called attention to the fact that even if there be full acceptance of the project principle, a group of earnest students might at some time want to know the story of Jesus, in which case a textbook dealing with the subject might fulfil the needs of their "project." They further suggest that they are not now attempting to prepare a curriculum in the sense of a course of textbooks to be regularly used year by year, but rather treatments of the various subjects of religious interest, which may be used by classes and groups when they have decided upon such study.

Evidently we are just ready for a thorough examination of all the problems of curriculum. The next few years may see some radical readjustments. As a matter of fact the very term curriculum is undergoing a change of meaning. It is so indefinite a term as now used that it is perhaps more confusing than enlightening. What we are really interested in is the religious development of children. Already in 1915 Hartshorne outlined a technique for obtaining first-hand data regarding this development (*Religious Education,* October, 1915), and utilized the method in his *Childhood and Character* (1919). If we can know how children grow in religious experience, what conditions, practices, knowledge, activities, help in their growth, we have of course solved the problems of curriculum as well as all others that confront us. The recognition of this fundamental need has led to the inauguration by the Institute

of Social and Religious Research of an investigation into the religious life of children. It is under the general direction of Professor Thorndike and is being carried on by Professors Hartshorne and May. So we swing back to the child-study movement from which our modern religious education started, but the development of the technique of observing and recording the facts in child life will give us very much more accurate data. The old books furnished us easy generalizations about the characteristics of the various stages of child life. In the popular mind there are still periods of memory, hero worship, the "gang," idealism, etc. The statements have been passed on from writer to writer. The whole subject needs to be re-examined. Our entire educational program is dependent upon this study of the facts. It is, of course, an infinitely delicate task. The subtle reactions of personality are very difficult to follow. We shall need to proceed humbly as well as earnestly in the significant quest.

There have been some interesting developments in the quarter-century in the study of the history of religious education. Trumbull's *Yale Lectures on the Sunday School* (1888) was the best that had been done up to that time. It was an excellent treatment of the material then generally known but was not in any sense a critical historical work. Brown, *Sunday School Movements in America* (1901), was the first scholarly attempt to interpret the meaning of this lay enterprise in the American church.[7]

Generally educators have known little about the critical study of the Bible and biblical scholars have known little about the meaning of education, hence neither was competent

[7] Other investigations followed: Erb, *The Development of the Young People's Movement* (1917), Wardle, *History of the Sunday School Movement in the Methodist Episcopal Church* (1918).

to give us a study of education in Israel and in the early Christian church. The histories of religious education have assumed that there were organized schools in early Israel and some have supposed that the so-called "schools" of the prophets were theological seminaries. Professor Fletcher H. Swift did a great service in his *Education in Ancient Israel to 70 A. D.* (1919), the first scientific study of the subject. The investigation should be pursued in the same spirit through the history of the church. Two significant volumes[8] have recently come from the Yale University Press, giving promise of a series of historical studies under the editorship of Professors Weigle and Wright.

Education has been seeking to become an exact science. William James was a bit skeptical of brass instruments, but educationists have been endeavoring to devise means by which they could test their own processes. What is the best method of teaching reading, writing, spelling, language, arithmetic? This is no longer a matter of guesswork. There is a considerable body of data from verifiable experiment. More and more the teacher may know what he is doing instead of doing what seems good and hoping for good results. Can we test our process in religious education? Can we measure any of our results? Can we determine the growth of character, the development of religious attitude? These are the questions eagerly asked in this field today. A number of essays have been made.[9] The study is still in its beginning. Professor Star-

[8] Stewart, *A History of Religious Education in Connecticut to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century* (1924), Brewer, *A History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835* (1924).

[9] Foster, "Standard Efficiency Tests for Boys," *Religious Education* (February, 1917); Clara F. and Laura M. Chassell, "A Test of Religious Ideas Involving the Ranking of Selected Answers," *Religious Education* (February, 1922); Clara F. Chassell, "Some New Tests in Religious Education," *Religious Education* (December,

buck at the Character Education Station, Iowa State University, is developing some very interesting tests. The most elaborate attempt at the measurement of religious education is the Indiana Survey, made under the direction of Dean Walter S. Athearn. It was a part of the Interchurch Movement and suffered from the sudden collapse of that ambitious undertaking. However, Dean Athearn and his colleagues completed the survey within certain limits and have published the results in three volumes. The second volume deals with measurements and standards. It has brought forth both favorable and adverse criticism, indicating the wide difference of opinion that prevails regarding the principles and technique of measurement.

A brilliant theological scholar recently expressed the opinion that religious education today is where theology was a generation ago. It is so anxious to be exact and scientific that it is devoted to abstractions and lost in definitions. Theology has discovered the value of simplicity and is expressing itself with far less technicality than in older days. Perhaps this kindly observer from the outside is right. Certain it is that at the end of a quarter of a century of study we find ourselves far less certain of our way than we thought we were when we were contending for graded lessons and for religious instruction "suited to the needs of the child"; when we thought that the pious phrase "the child in the midst" really settled important questions. But our confusion is the result of the extraordinary growth of activity and interest in religious education, of the endeavor to understand what the various schools of psy-

---

1921); Hartshorne, "The Measurement of Growth in Religion," *Religious Education* (June, 1921); Voelker, *The Function of Ideals in Social Education*, Teachers' College (1921).

chology, of social psychology, and of education, have to contribute to our science, of the very brief time in which experimentation and discussion have been carried on, of the urgent necessity for preparing workers for the fields that were clamoring to be supplied and textbooks for the teachers that were asking for help. With ten or a dozen centers that are becoming equipped to do good work, with a corps of able young scholars eager to find the way, it ought to be possible for religious education in the second quarter of the century to make a notable advance. When those who saw the beginnings of this movement look back upon the way that we have come they realize how really significant the progress has been. If we have not done all that we had hoped it is partly because there was so much more to be done than we had thought.

AMERICAN PREACHING

OZORA S. DAVIS

In spite of the common charge against preaching that it is bound to doctrine and tradition, there is no area of thought and action that is more quickly responsive to the influences of the age than the Christian pulpit. Sermons register trends in popular life with exceeding accuracy and sensitiveness. In attempting a study of contemporary sermons or in making a comparative estimate of the preaching of any two periods, we are fronted with an initial difficulty. It is impossible either to hear or to read more than a small fraction of the discourses that are actually delivered. The sermon is an ephemeral utterance; only relatively few ever endure in printed form. In spite of this disadvantage, however, we have enough material at hand to enable us with sufficient confidence to undertake an estimate of the changes that have taken place in preaching during the last twenty-five years.

It will be necessary to limit the field of the present inquiry. The space at our command is such that the material surveyed must be confined quite closely to the activities of the American Protestant pulpit since the year 1900. Interesting side lights are to be had from the preaching of Roman Catholic priests and Jewish rabbis; the English and Scottish sermons at hand are also of value; but our findings are concerned practically with the field delimited above.

There are two primary sources of data: the series of "Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching," delivered at Yale University almost every year; and the published sermons of the

years 1900 and 1925. The former is undoubtedly the one most valuable source of inspiration and guidance for preachers in America. There are other lectureships also which are contributing largely to the efficiency of the modern pulpit; but the Yale Lectures have been longest in the field and their service has been most distinguished.

A review of the trends in American preaching as reflected in these Yale Lectures is timely and profitable. Instead of reporting on this separately and at this point, we shall unite with such a survey our findings from a comparative study of the published sermons of 1900 and 1925.

It is quite impossible to list even the more important titles of the printed sermons of these two years. Only one significant fact must be observed. The Trade Lists of 1900 show thirty volumes of sermons issued. The first place among these is naturally occupied by the preaching of Dwight L. Moody, who had died in the previous year. The corresponding lists of the year 1925 show more than twice the number of single volumes issued, as well as several lectures on homiletics. The principal change, however, is indicated by the publication of collections of sermons. The volume edited by Joseph Fort Newton, *Best Sermons, 1924,* was followed the next year by *Week-day Sermons in King's Chapel; The American Pulpit by Twenty-five Representative Preachers;* and, from across the Atlantic, *British Preachers,* and *Twenty Sermons by Famous Scotch Preachers.* There never has been a more evident testimony to the popular interest in preaching than the printed volumes of the year 1925. Publishers are not in business merely for their health; this kind of product must have paid.

Turning now to a study of these two sources, we note first of all the emphasis placed upon the personality and the preparation of the preacher himself.

When Phillips Brooks gave the Yale Lectures in 1877 he defined with new force the fact that preaching is "truth through personality"; that the preparation of the sermon is essentially the preparation of the preacher. During the last quarter-century this truth has been kept constantly to the front in lectures on preaching, in estimates of preaching by preachers, and in sermons where any such affirmation might be pertinent. The first aspect of preaching since 1900 that appears continuously and with growing clearness is the emphasis upon the personality of the preacher and the reality of his own spiritual life and experience as the guaranty of his message expressed in the sermon. This has not been an emphasis easy to maintain, for the office of the minister has grown immensely in its range and urgency during these twenty-five years. The demand for programs of religious education and social service; the pressing duties in civic and philanthropic organizations; community service that calls for the skill and strength of a social engineer; all these have come into the definition of the function of the ministry and have demanded the hours and energies that were available for spiritual culture in a more leisurely world during the last century. The modern minister must gain his spiritual experience, not in quietness, but fairly and fully in the stream of the world.

The best single expression of the need of the spiritual culture of the preacher is contained in the Yale Lectures of 1911 by Frank W. Gunsaulus (*The Minister and the Spiritual Life*). The lecturer was eminently fitted to illustrate the proposition defined in the published volume. He said:

> The only essential and distinctive thing in the minister's life and conduct is spirituality. His apparent success in being this or that, and his facility in doing this or that ever so brilliantly, does not dazzle the world; it has long ago shut its eye and feels about searchingly, and almost

pathetically, for the reality which the ministry in the last issue of the world's confidence must be held to possess—the secret and spring of the life of the world and himself—spirituality.

Dr. Gunsaulus defined spirituality in the terms of the highest manliness, the realization of all that is implicit in the idea of a child of God. It was no aloof and inhuman quality but the most wholesome and healthy perfection of personality.

Thus the preacher has been defined still more precisely in the last half-century as every inch a man, living the largest possible human life in the range of its intention and the depth of its service.[1] There is a healthy reality in this discussion of the spiritual background of preaching that is entirely remote from some of the lectures of even fifty years ago.

It is common practice to consider the sermon under the two phases of form and content. We will, therefore, study briefly now the changes that have taken place in the form of the sermon, especially as we are able to observe it in the Protestant pulpit. There are certain changes that are immediately apparent. The first is in respect to length or time for delivery. At least two influences have been at work modifying the popular demand and the homiletical practice in respect to the length of the sermon. One is the speeding up of life which has made worshipers restless and unwilling to sit through the hour-long sermons of a century ago or even the forty-five minute sermons of fifty years ago. The age is nervous and "time is money." Then the enrichment of the service with liturgical

[1] It is impossible to enumerate the varied sources in which emphasis upon the subject of the Gunsaulus lectures is to be found. Concisely, it might be said that it is found everywhere, vividly recognized and strongly stressed. Tilroe (*Sent Forth*, 1923) has a strong chapter entitled, "The Personal Equation." Ernest Clyde Wareing has published a book on the matter, pitched in a high key (*Critical Hours in the Preacher's Life*, 1923). Going farther afield, we find it in Berkowitz (*Intimate Glimpses of the Rabbi's Career*, 1921) and Carey (*My Priesthood*, 1918).

elements has grown rapidly in those churches that have hitherto laid slight stress upon ritual. The introduction of more music and responsive readings has cut the time for the "long prayer" and the sermon. The further extension of this movement, as seems likely, may curtail still more the time for the sermon. Therefore, the preacher today must limit himself to half an hour and probably less for the sermon; he must study and achieve compactness and energy; he must "put it across" quickly and accurately. This meaningful phrase comes from the baseball field and implies that the one-two-three sermon "points" must be shot across the plate with swiftness and precision and good judgment or the preacher will be batted out of the box.

The length of the sermon, however, is only a minor aspect of its changed status due to the enrichment of the order of worship in the non-liturgical churches. It has come to be regarded not as an end in itself but as a part of a dignified and beautiful order of service. It has become itself liturgical in the ideal of many of the preachers of the day whose influence is most widely extended. The old question, "Am I prepared to preach?" has assumed this new and more searching form, "Am I prepared to lead the worship of the congregation, of which preaching is a part?" The honest answer to that question brings the preacher at once into the presence of a new set of values for his sermon as well as for his total task as a Christian preacher. One of the most conclusive replies to the prevalent criticism of the sermon is furnished by this new interpretation of it as an essential factor in a unified liturgy of worship. Thus it ceases to be a burden, or a detail pressed too much into the forefront of the service rendered by the church and preacher to the community; it is itself a thing of beauty and order.

In respect to the delivery of the sermon there is a marked change from the oratorical to the conversational style. The age of Henry Ward Beecher and Richard Salter Storrs, eminent in the group of "pulpit orators," is followed by a period of preachers who are less concerned with oratory and more eager to effect the transfer of their message by the cogency of their logic and the connection of their themes with the actual life of the time. This does not mean that oratory is undervalued; it simply means that it is less used as the major method to be observed in the delivery of the sermon. Today a preacher would probably be somewhat embarrassed at being called a "pulpit orator."

Another phase of the altered form of the modern sermon is its freedom from the technical terms of theology and its use of the vivid and energetic vocabulary of the actual world where men and women think and love and act. This does not sanction the use of slang or vulgarity of any kind; it is seen in the terse, clear, comprehensible vocabulary of Charles Reynolds Brown, Charles Edward Jefferson, and Harry Emerson Fosdick. They employ pure English, which is clear because it is the language of today and is in actual use in home and factory. This is a welcome relief from the more formal and technical vocabulary of the last century.

It is in the materials used in the sermon, however, that the greatest changes are seen, and we now pass to consider these.

The first is the reality of the subject matter and the way in which it is directly related to life and human experience. In the present day we are certainly completing the movement away from the artificial or the dogmatic which marked the sermon of half a century ago. This is stated so clearly by Dr. T. T. Munger in his study of the ministry of Horace Bushnell that we cannot express it better than by a quotation.

It is impossible to form a just estimate of Bushnell's preaching without taking into account that of the day. It was a style of preaching in which nature and life were fairly driven off the field. There was no such thing as a direct look. Everything was viewed through four or five dominant doctrines that prescribed the thought, whatever might be the subject. The Fall gave the key-note, and a constant warning rang in the ears of preacher and people; fear of unsoundness and the "system" determined the conclusion. The themes were great, but the assumptions and the method determined in advance what was to be said.[2]

The emancipation of the American pulpit from this bondage was well under way by the beginning of the century; but it was far from completed. It is safe to say that the most influential preachers today are those who have broken from the dogmatic fetters and are taking "the direct look" at life. The actual experience of living men and women in their experiment with the principles of Jesus as a way of living furnishes the most and the best of the material that is found in the sermons of today.

A primary question to be raised in studying the subject matter of preaching during the last quarter-century is whether or not its essential "message" has changed. This is the principal factor in the conception of preaching: it is a message and the preacher is the herald or messenger of good news. The sermon differs from other forms of oral address most radically in this: it carries the burden of a message, urgent, clear, and full of meaning to all those who will listen to it. The preacher must be dead in earnest about what he is saying; otherwise he is not a preacher. A careful study of the sermons of 1900 and 1925 reveals no radical change in this central fact of preaching. Naturally, we expect to find this in the orthodox and evangelistic group. Indeed, preachers of this type always have claimed that this is the primary warrant both for their ma-

[2] Munger, *Horace Bushnell*, 1899, p. 285.

terial and for their method; they have been sure that they were driven by the urge of their good news to be fearless and sometimes even unconventional witnesses to the "old-time religion." So Dr. John Roach Straton, in the Preface to *The Old Gospel at the Heart of the Metropolis,* 1925, says:

> In bringing together the group of sermons contained in this volume, the purpose has been not so much to effect a logical unfoldment of any theme, but rather to give typical messages that have been owned and used of God, in the conversion of sinners and the reconsecration of saints, here at the heart of America's metropolis.

From the other camp issues a volume entitled *Week-day Sermons in King's Chapel,* 1925. The editor, Dr. Harold E. B. Speight, has this to say concerning the factor of "message" in the twenty-eight sermons which make up the collection:

> When the Christian faith is proclaimed in its own right as an attitude of trust and confidence that gives to everyday tasks a new worth and meaning, as a mood of the spirit that will bless all life if it becomes habitual, ... the good tidings are heard gladly and the pulpit is accorded as great a respect as it ever had. . . . . Abandonment of revivalistic methods does not necessarily spell decline of concern for the souls of men and women. A faith . . . . that rests on the certainties of our being . . . . is a faith so full of hope for men . . . . that its issue is not only in ardor but in action.

There is unity of agreement, therefore, that the factor of urgency is not lost from the pulpit today, when preachers of either the liberal or conservative school give themselves to their work in full consciousness of the meaning of their message for the life of their time.

Back of every sermon lies a body of truth, a theology. The message must come to definite expression in the sermon. When we study this underlying theology, we find that there have been profound changes. On the one hand we meet the same

statements that were current not only twenty-five years ago but centuries since as well. Rev. William A. Sunday starts his sermon in *The American Pulpit,* 1925:

> Some folks do not believe in miracles. I do. A denial of miracles is a denial of the virgin birth of Jesus. The Christian religion stands or falls on the virgin birth of Christ. God created Adam and Eve without human agencies. He could and did create Jesus supernaturally. I place no limit on what God can do. If you begin to limit God, then there is no God.

Rev. Mark A. Matthews of Seattle begins his sermon in the same volume with this paragraph:

> The most important subject that could possibly be discussed is the virgin birth of Jesus. It is the battle ground of belief, and within the confines of its discussion are to be found two contending forces—the enemies of God and the children of God. . . . . God's children know, experimentally as well as historically, the truth of the doctrine. They have experienced its blessedness, and are not shaken in their faith nor in their conception of the truth.

These two men must voice the mind of a large constituency, since they are two of the twenty-five chosen by the votes of about 25,000 American ministers as the most influential preachers in the American church.

It is undoubtedly fair to state that the Articles of the Niagara Bible Conference, frequently published (*Christian Workers Magazine,* December, 1913), express the theological "message" of the great number of preachers represented by the two quoted above.

The theological content of "liberal" sermons cannot be defined with such instant exactness, since it is not represented in any one uniform creed or any particular volume of "Systematic" theology. The influence of Professor William Newton Clarke, *An Outline of Christian Theology,* has been potent

throughout the period since 1894, when the volume was copyrighted. From a study of about forty sermons published during the last five years, we summarize as follows:

The older dogmatic statements do not appear as often as they did a quarter-century ago. The sovereignty of God; the divine election; the substitutionary blood atonement of Christ; the total depravity of man and his inability to choose God without the aid of prevenient grace; the inerrancy of the Bible; the austere negative demands of the Puritan pulpit; the threat of hell and the rewards of heaven—all these great interests of the pulpit in America are either wholly absent or held in abeyance.

On the other hand, the following doctrines are in constant evidence: The reality and reasonableness of religion; a Christ-like God, not so much the transcendent sovereign as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"; the redemptive power of sacrificial love, evident and potent in the death of Christ, a fact which is greater and more vital than any or all explanations of it; the interpretation of the Christian experience in the terms of moral union with Christ; therefore a tendency to renew the meaning of Paul's "in Christ" and to accent the mystical rather than the dogmatic or institutional phases of the Christian religion; the representation of the Christian religion as "a way of living according to the principles of Jesus and in fellowship with him"; therefore, a major accent upon the central reality of the living Christ; intense moral passion concerning the practical matters of daily life; yearning for social justice and the realization of the Kingdom of God; international sympathy and passion.[3]

[3] While creed-making is not the habit of the liberal preachers, they sometimes undertake confessional statements, as, for example, Richard Roberts in *Best Sermons*, 1924, page 62. It is wide of the older theological creeds; it starts with the love of

Similar differences between conservatives and liberals are observable when the sermons published in 1900 are reviewed, although the product then is so small in comparison with the issues of 1925. Judged by the sermons at hand, it is apparent that the liberal wing has progressed in the clearness of its separation from the static orthodox position; the stand-pat group is even more definitely fixed; and the mediating group is somewhat incoherent in the presence of the fierce conflict between the fundamentalists and the modernists.

Study of the earliest recorded Christian preaching reveals the reinforcement of the proclamation of the message by the teaching of the truth that had been thus declared. When the message had been accepted it was necessary to unfold it still more completely as a way of life. The last twenty-five years in American preaching has seen a strong emphasis upon the teaching task of the preacher. The sermon as a message has been strongly influenced by this fact.

One of the most significant expressions of this tendency is found in the Yale Lectures of President Faunce, *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry,* 1908. Dr. Faunce says:

> Modern preaching has shaken off the shackles of the homiletic "firstly" and "secondly"; it has escaped from surplice and pulpit and dim religious light; it has ceased to care for metaphysical formula, and girding itself with the weapons of the time, it sallies forth in broad daylight into market-place and mill and legislature and court, to do battle for the moral ideals of the race.

The real meaning of this development, which is a fair statement of the changes which our own study reveals, is to

---

God and the worth of the Cross; it includes the spiritual meaning of life, the immortal worth of every soul, the practicability of the Kingdom of God, and the sacramental value of the day's work.

be found in the interpretation of the preacher's work as also essentially that of the teacher. This, Dr. Faunce is sure, is true to the earliest Christian ideal as well as in accord with the essential needs of the present day. It involves a new appreciation of the value of psychology; it opens wider realms of truth and defines the relation of the preacher to them; it gives the church and the minister a program of religious education which enlists workers with greater zest. It is, in short, an ideal that will bring back power to the preacher and new life to the pew.

Matching this definition of the ideal has gone the larger and more highly organized definition of the practical program of the church for the education of all its members in morals and religion. The day school of religious education seems to be growing in favor.

The pulpit has responded sensitively to this general movement of thought in the churches. It is clear that the preachers of today incline more to the methods of the teacher than they do to the earlier technique of the orator and the theologian in the pulpit. Sermon subjects are more educational and less controversial.[4]

One of the most recent series of lectures on preaching, by Gossip (*In Christ's Stead: The Warrack Lectures for 1925*), discusses at considerable length the teaching purpose of the sermon. It is impossible adequately to quote this lecturer and preacher; but briefly, he shows what tremendous influence the pulpit has exerted upon the way in which the church is learning how to appropriate the enlarged conception of all truth in

[4] Such a book as Thiselton Mark, *The Pedagogics of Preaching*, 1911, is indicative of this emphasis. He quotes Patterson du Bois to the effect that the methods of Jesus were educational and that the truth which he expressed was meant to be received and extended in this way.

our time, which, he says, is "simply because there has been a new atmosphere in the sermons that has told upon the hearers, even without them realizing it. The new climate in the pulpit has passed to the pews."

Another marked characteristic of the pulpit today as compared with that of a quarter-century ago is the attitude of preachers to science. At the present time we are perhaps too much in the midst of the dust and noise of the conflict that has suddenly arisen, especially over the teaching of evolution, to see just what it means. Preachers who supposed that the battle had been fought out twenty-five years ago are bewildered to find themselves in the thick of it once more. Many ministers ignore it, seeking to find more healthy and vital interests in the great ethical engagements of the day; others take sides aggressively, with all the zeal of battle shown by crusaders of every sort; others seek to unite the two parties in an irenic spirit. The most thoughtful preachers seek to show that there is no conflict between science and religion. In *Week-day Sermons in King's Chapel,* 1925, Dr. William P. Merrill, recognizing the grave danger in failing to preserve our reverence in the face of the universe, still claims that Jesus

"stood for the open mind, for the whole view of life, for the sacredness of the common, for the God of daily life. Modern science is the legitimate child and heir of his spirit. The magnificent philosophy of evolution could have come to light only where Christ had taught the souls of men to look everywhere for God and truth.

Scientific illustrations crowd recent sermons, especially the analogy of the radio, with its suggestiveness concerning the possibility of communion with the spiritual, and the electronic construction of the universe, with its apparent discounting of the older materialism. Ministers are not lecturing on scientific

subjects; but they are apparently reading such books as *The Outline of Science* and are making use of the material that they find richly contained there.

Another dominant note in American preaching that has grown steadily during the last quarter-century is the increasing concern for the social applications of the gospel. The introduction of programs of social service into the practical work of the church has kept pace with the social accent of the pulpit. Perhaps it has been overstressed; certainly it needs the corrective of a corresponding emphasis upon individualism.

In the Yale Lectures we find two volumes that lay particular emphasis on this point, although the whole series during the period under survey is charged with social passion. Brown, *The Social Message of the Modern Pulpit,* 1906, attacked the problem directly; Coffin, *In a Day of Social Rebuilding,* 1918, studied the ministry from the social point of view. The relation of the Christian people to industry, political ideals, social purity, and international justice has been defined in many books which have exerted strong influence upon preachers.[5]

The same tendency is reflected in the increasing teaching of social ethics and kindred subjects in the theological schools and the colleges.[6] In the pulpit there has been a corresponding

[5] *The Christian Ministry and the Social Order,* 1909, consisted of lectures given at Yale Divinity School. Ward, *The Gospel for a Working World,* 1918, and *The New Social Order,* 1919; Johnson, *The New Spirit in Industry,* 1919; Davis, *Preaching the Social Gospel,* 1922, are a few out of many titles.

[6] Conspicuous examples are Graham Taylor and Charles R. Henderson in Chicago and Francis G. Peabody at Harvard. The former was especially a pioneer in the introduction of what was known as Christian sociology into a theological seminary and the founder of Chicago Commons as a practical experiment with the ideals which he defined in his lecture-room. The work of Edward A. Steiner in Grinnell College is noteworthy.

development. The preachers have taken their stand, perhaps not always wisely in respect to their accurate knowledge of all the conditions obtaining in this bewildering field, but certainly zealously and with a desire for fair play, in the defense of the full application of the principles of Jesus in the entire range of human life. They have furnished the material on which Bishop Charles D. Williams, himself a conspicuous example of the same temper, founded his Yale Lectures (*The Prophetic Ministry for Today,* 1921). At this point the historical study of the Bible has furnished the pulpit with fresh material which has been repeated to communities with the flaming spirit of the prophets themselves.

It has been a serious and somewhat hazardous enterprise thus to treat religion as an inclusive interest and energy, embracing the total personality and the whole of life. It has grown out of the conviction that personality is not to be understood by any interpretation of it as built in water-tight compartments. There have been and still are inspiring teachers in this field, whose influence upon the pulpit is commanding.[7] The fact of social solidarity has won the assent and kindled the imagination of the preachers and they have flung their message into the American communities with eager passion.

Inevitably there has been criticism of the effort of the pulpit to give this wider application to the teachings of Jesus. Demands have come from many sources that the preacher

[7] Probably the influence of Walter Rauschenbusch has been the most conspicuous. He was teacher, preacher, and writer. The impression of his books has been profound. *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* 1907, *Christianizing the Social Order,* 1912, *Prayers of the Social Awakening, The Social Principles of Jesus,* 1916, and *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* 1917, perhaps bit into the minds and hearts of the preachers as no other single writer did. Johnson and Holt (*Christian Ideals in Industry,* 1924) represent the continued teaching in the same field.

should "stick to his last" and confine himself to the "simple gospel." There have doubtless been hasty and unwise interpretations of the work of preaching in this field. A study of the methods of Jesus as well as his words reveals the fact that he surely laid major emphasis upon the individual, trusting that those who accepted his way of living would change their environment after they had themselves been changed through inner renewal by the energy of his motives. It has been said repeatedly that the pig makes his sty, and that, so long as he is what he is, it is merely a tragic failure to "put the pig in the parlor" and expect to keep the parlor clean. On the other hand, the challenge of social workers has been accepted by the preachers, who have seen the futility of sending "converts" back into the same old surroundings, trusting wholly in renewed personality to create new environment. The conclusions of social workers have become also the working theories of preachers in this respect. These are put concisely by Graham Taylor as follows:

> You cannot have a saved life survive always in unsaved surroundings. You cannot have a saved soul in a lost body. You cannot be half saved, inside and not outside. You must save a larger and larger part of the world's and man's human relationships, and make his surroundings at least compatible with the ideals of life which you are holding out to him, if he is ever to realize those ideals. The undoing of "evangelized" souls by unevangelized surroundings and relationships is the tragedy of modern religious experience.[8]

This conception of the relation of environment to the process of individual salvation has become one of the underlying convictions of the modern pulpit in America and has given a new content and vigor to the idea of "the simple gospel."

The quarter-century under review has witnessed the

[8] *Religion in Social Action*, 1913, p. 28.

steady development of the habit of preaching to children. There has been a growing output of printed sermons of this character. In one of the most suggestive and interesting of these, *The Children's Bread,* 1916, Rev. J. Edgar Park reports the changes in the homiletical habits of a certain minister, who in process of time became a grandfather. "When his second grandchild was born he began to preach to children and for the first time the parents began to understand his sermons." That ministers have generally improved in technique and do not indulge in baby talk in their children's sermons appears clearly in the most recent of these published collections. The minister today needs to master the method of handling not only the short sermon appropriate for vesper and chapel services but also the difficult address to the congregation of children.

Still more characteristic of this period of development is the appearance and popularity of the sermon on a book or a piece of literature. This has resulted not only in the definition of a particular sermon type but has also called into being a large amount of literature on the religious values and use of the literature of power. The preacher best known for his use of the "book sermon" is Rev. William L. Stidger. The best example of his method may be seen in *There are Sermons in Books* and *Finding God in Books,* 1925. He names these discourses "Dramatic Book Sermons" and "Drama Sermons." By means of these, the preacher affirms, "he makes his own preaching ministry live and glow with real human beings who walk up and down his pulpit platform, in dialogue and dramatic scene, teaching their lesson and giving their spiritual impetus."[9]

[9] The demand for material to be used in this developing practice has called a considerable literature into being, of which the following titles are important: Da-

One more particular type of preaching calls for brief reference. Interest in biographies and character study has been increasing during the past few years. The interpretation of personality problems through the analysis of the outstanding men and women of history, and especially those who move through the Bible narratives, has assumed new value. The way-making work of Professor Ambrose W. Vernon in this field will undoubtedly be increasingly apparent in the preaching of the years to come. The skill and power with which Alexander Whyte, of Edinburgh, preached on great characters have been both the inspiration and the despair of many followers afar off. One of the most fertile contributions to the printed sermons in this field comes from the pulpit of Rev. Clovis G. Chappell.[10] The task of interpreting the Bible characters in fresh and illuminating style is far more difficult than it might appear at first glance. It is being done generally with good taste and clarifying effectiveness.

The most significant influence exerted upon preaching during the quarter-century arose out of the fearful struggle of the Great War. The exact force of this upon the American pulpit we probably cannot correctly evaluate as yet. We do not see clearly what tendencies may issue from it. The Yale Lectures recognized the significance of the conflict and Dr. John Kelman gave in 1919 his series on *The War and Preach-*

---

vies, *Spiritual Voices in Modern Literature,* 1919; Mosher, *The Promise of the Christ-Age in Recent Literature,* 1912; Crow, *Christ in the Poetry of Today,* 1918; Hoyt, *The Spiritual Message of Modern English Poetry,* 1924; Bailey, *Religious Thought in the Greater American Poets,* 1922. Two rich and well-selected anthologies of recent date are: Hill, *The World's Great Religious Poetry,* 1924, and Merrifield, *Modern Religious Verse and Prose,* 1925.

[10] Four titles are: *Sermons on Old Testament Characters,* 1925; *Sermons on Biblical Characters,* 1922; *More Sermons on Biblical Characters,* 1923; *Sermons on New Testament Characters,* 1924.

ing.[11] The lectures grew out of practical experience and they outline certain trends which are still going on.

The first result of the Great War, which appears in the pulpit of 1925, is a reaffirmation by Christian preachers of the duty to work for the outliving of war by the gradual popular conquest of the principles of love, good will, and peace, which are central in the Christian gospel. The attitudes of preachers today vary in all degrees from non-resistant pacifism to the defense of war as an ultimate resource whose final abolition is to be expected as mankind finally lets the ape and tiger die within him. No other group of public leaders except the official champions of organized peace societies is taking such high ground on this subject as the preachers. The continued influence of their work will count mightily for the creation of such popular ideals and standards as will finally enable the race to outlive the curse of war, not by means of legislation against it or by disarmament, but by the creation of humane and fraternal attitudes in the presence of which fratricidal war will be forever impossible. The study of announced sermon subjects reveals widespread discussion of the matter, increasing rather than diminishing.

The subject of world-peace, however, is being presented on the background of a still broader platform of international and inter-racial unity and good will. The ideal is ahead of the current practice, even by those who accept the principle as a true basis of living. The rebuke of race hatred; the affirmation of the oneness of humanity; the insistence upon the inclu-

[11] While all books which bear either the name or the mark of the Great War are now "dead" from the point of publisher's sales, certain volumes of the war time are still worth recalling: Tiplady, *The Cross at the Front,* 1917, and *The Soul of the Soldier,* 1918; Hankey, *A Student in Arms* (two series), 1917; Davis, *The Gospel in the Light of the Great War,* 1919.

siveness of the Christian standard of human unity in Christ—these have become within the past ten years themes of preaching to a degree never known before. The Protestant pulpit in America has taken this matter in earnest and is occupying high ground on the subject in spite of the disheartening obstacles which confront practical efforts to work it out. Patriotism is receiving a new and wider interpretation in the pulpit, often full in the face of the slogans and editorials of the daily press.

It is apparent that one cause, at least, for this attitude by the pulpit is the way in which, under the leadership chiefly of the same preachers, various denominational bodies have adopted "Social Creeds." These have stated fearlessly the sense of what it would mean in education, industry, politics, society, and international relations to apply the principles of Jesus in the whole range of human life. That these creeds and resolutions remain mere rhetoric and idealistic dreaming is true in certain cases; but they possess teeth and dynamite in themselves, and many preachers are discovering this fact. Conscious that these declarations furnish them with dependable backing, the preachers are speaking out right boldly in God's name.

Another influence that has been operating to bring about this result is the modern discovery of the mission and message of the Old Testament prophet. With new clearness and force it is seen that these great characters were not wizards foretelling events like soothsayers; they were patriots and statesmen, rebuking the sins of their times and defining policies that were surely the will of God. The Hebrew prophet has re-entered the Christian pulpit, not with a grotesque foretelling of

dates and dispensations, but with a veritable word from God to a generation bewildered from carnage and drenched in blood and tears. The pulpit has been elevated and ransomed by this discovery and now speaks to its generation with a word of prophecy made more sure.

No study of the quarter-century closing with 1925 would be complete that failed to reckon with one of the most significant discoveries in history, the radio. Just what its influence upon preaching may become we cannot now determine. That it has given the preacher an opportunity and the pulpit an expansion never dreamed of before admits of no doubt. Looked at from the standpoint of the preacher himself, the privilege accruing to those who use the radio is astonishing. Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, of Brooklyn, numbers his invisible audience undoubtedly by scores of thousands every Sunday afternoon. The opportunity for popular preaching thus afforded makes the audiences of some of the famous outdoor preachers of the Middle Ages seem small, and even Whitefield's crowds dwindle in comparison. The preachers of the fundamentalist type have seized upon the opportunity with excellent strategy. Voliva at Zion City and Mrs. Macpherson at Los Angeles have capitalized this new discovery with amazing success. The influence upon the size of visible congregations is not yet determined. Those who foresee the speedy coming of the time when worship will be comfortably enjoyed at home by listeners-in, who will remorselessly tune out the dull preachers and the imperfect music and tune in on the interesting preachers and the fine choirs, do not reckon with the power of the visible speaker, the worshiping congregation, and the demand for fellowship in worship. Probably

the gains have been more than the losses up to the present time in respect to the visible congregation. What the future has in store, however, cannot be foretold. It is undoubtedly safe to say that the radio will not dethrone preaching but will, in the end, give the true preacher still greater power over a wider audience.

THOUGHT CONCERNING PROTESTANT FOREIGN MISSIONS

ARCHIBALD G. BAKER

The last twenty-five years have been marked by the challenging of the white man's supremacy, the rise of Oriental nationalism, the cataclysm of the world-war, the gradual development of a community of ideas and customs throughout the world, and by an extension of the scientific and historical method into the realm of the cultural and religious life of man. Such profound world transformations as these have inevitably been shaping our thought concerning the nature of religion, the needs of the world, and the character of the missionary enterprise.

Neither the missionary nor the missionary administrator has been an armchair philosopher. Foreign missions are essentially an enterprise, and have kept in touch with reality. Consequently the problems which have most immediately occupied attention have been practical problems, arising out of concrete situations. Nevertheless, as many of these practical matters eventually involved deeper issues, the church has been compelled to speculate and theorize concerning the inner meaning of its task.

I

A century of Protestant missions had witnessed the gradual conversion of the church to the missionary enterprise; it had opened the closed doors; it had accumulated a vast fund of missionary experience; it had resulted in the standardiza-

tion of missionary methods and agencies; it had built up and perfected imposing missionary organizations; it had resulted in such a fruitage of converts and institutions as seemed to warrant every confidence that the whole world might be "evangelized" in one generation, provided certain conditions were fulfilled. These conditions were held to be, first, an adequate increase in the resources of both money and men; second, certain spiritual qualifications on the part of the church and its missionaries; third, the indispensable and mysterious operation of the Spirit of God. A changing theology had by this time given the world a missionary God. It remained now to produce a 100 per cent missionary church, and in due season the world would be evangelized.

1. Under the influence of such an interpretation it was but natural that much thought and attention should continue to be given, especially by those in positions of responsibility, to the creation of sentiment among the churches and to enlisting their more hearty support, and to the reorganization of denominational machinery so as to effect a closer co-ordination among the various denominational agencies. In the homeland administrative efficiency, the promotion of interest, and enthusiastic support have been the constant goal.[1]

2. On the foreign field every effort has been made to maintain and perfect the standard types of missionary activity inherited from the previous century. A brief review of educational developments may be taken as typical in this connection. On the one hand there has been a growing appre-

[1] For example, The Laymen's Missionary Movement, of 1906–8, and the various high-pressure campaigns within the respective denominations culminating in the Interchurch World Movement of 1920. Closer articulation of denominational machinery has been effected by Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Disciples, and the United Church of Canada.

ciation of the significance of the educational process in missionary propaganda, and consequently a greater emphasis upon the same. On the other hand, the rapid development of national systems has thrust upon the missionary forces the necessity of facing a number of practical problems of readjustment, and also the more theoretical problem of justifying the continuance of these educational institutions under religious control. At present it seems to be the accepted opinion that the justification of the mission school must be found in its superior excellence as an educational institution and as a center of Christian influence. To this end the old policy of diffusion must give way to the policy of concentration and co-operation; missionary educators must be equipped with the latest methods and technique; and the schools must prepare the students for a place in local and national life as well as in the Christian church. On the subject of the obligatory teaching of religion in mission schools, the submission to governmental supervision and regulations, and the precise object or objects of missionary education, there is still a considerable divergence of opinion.[2]

3. By the time that the Missionary Conference met in New York in 1900 the conscience of the church had become profoundly aroused over the needless duplication and expenditure incurred on the foreign field through denomina-

[2] *Edinburgh Conference* (1910), Vol. III; James L. Barton, *Educational Missions* (1913); Von Martin Schlunk, *Die Schulen für Eingeborene in den deutschen Schutzgebieten* (1914); Roland Allen, *Educational Principles and Missionary Methods* (1919); Commission report, *Village Education in India* (1920); W. Meston, *Aspects of Indian Educational Policy* (1922); James B. Webster, *Christian Education and National Consciousness in China* (1923); Phelps-Stokes Commissions (Thomas Jesse Jones, chairman), *Education in Africa* (1922), *Education in East Africa* (1925); Paul Monroe, "Mission Education and National Policy," *International Review of Missions* (1921), p. 321; China Educational Commission (E. D. Burton, chairman), *Christian Education in China* (1922).

tional divisions, and the reproach cast thereby upon the Kingdom of Christ. On this occasion a stirring appeal was issued to work and pray for Christian unity. Furthermore, the definite position was taken that the best way to bring about a larger degree of Christian unity was to begin at those points where co-operation could be effected most readily. A constant effort has been made to carry out this policy. Schools and hospitals have become the centers of co-operative activity. Missions of kindred denominations have united under joint administrations. Different denominational missions, and, more recently, the national churches also, have united in national Christian councils. In each of the homelands denominational boards have organized themselves together in national councils or conferences, and the total movement has reached its climax in the International Missionary Council, which stands before the world today as the one central and representative body of the missionary enterprise of the Protestant churches.[3] This movement toward Christian fellowship has been in response not simply to a growing sentiment among the churches at home, but also to an ever increasing insistence on the part of national leaders and churches abroad. Christian people still find themselves distraught between denominational loyalties and convictions on the one hand and the broader claims and calls of the Kingdom of God on the other; organic church unity is still a long way off, but in the meantime they are learning to discuss, to plan, and to labor together in a growing

[3] For greater details, cf. S. G. Inman, *Christian Co-operation in Latin America* (1917); J. H. Oldham, "New Spiritual Adventures in the Mission Field," *I.R.M.* (October, 1922). On the steps leading to the transformation of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee into the present International Missionary Council, cf. J. H. Oldham, "A New Beginning of International Missionary Co-operation," *I.R.M.* (1920), p. 481; G. A. Gollock, "Fifteen Years' Growth: A Study in Missionary Co-operation," *I.R.M.* (January, 1926).

variety of activities, and are thus entering into a deeper fellowship and mutual respect.[4]

4. From the days of Carey it has been recognized that eventually the daughter churches must be freed from the jurisdiction of the mother churches of the West, but as yet this consummation seemed to be a long way off. Little by little, however, the agitation in favor of nationalism and self-realization, which arose first of all in Japan, began to spread to India, China, the Philippines, Africa, and Moslem lands. These political movements were reflected in new aspirations for local autonomy within the church. To the credit of both missionary and national leaders let it be said that this question of readjustment has rarely been approached in a doctrinaire or academic spirit. Each case has been recognized as a definite point of strain and friction and has been considered in the light of local conditions and of the particular church polity of the parties concerned. Methodists have approached the matter from one point of view; Congregationalists, from another. In Japan the dispute assumed one aspect; in South India, or China, another. The difficulty has been to recognize a new center of authority in a daughter church which has not yet attained to full maturity of experience or to a near approach to self-support. Those who lay great stress upon doctrinal conformity have had grave misgivings for the future orthodoxy of these liberated churches; some societies, conti-

[4] The subject of Christian unity and co-operation has been a constant one before all missionary conferences, from Edinburgh to the present day. Cf. also A. J. Brown, *Unity and Missions: Can a Divided Church Save the World?* (1915); William D. Mackenzie, "If the Church Were One," *Constructive Quarterly* (September, 1919, and December, 1919); Eugene Stock, "The Kikuyu Question," *Constructive Quarterly* (1919), p. 259; R. E. Speer, "Is Identity of Doctrine Necessary to Missionary Co-operation?" *I.R.M.* (October, 1923); The Bishop of Bombay, "Missionary Co-operation in the Face of Denominational Differences," *I.R.M.* (October, 1923).

nental as well as American, have been loath to relinquish the traditional paternalism through lack of confidence in national leadership; it is recognized by all that certain mission fields are not yet ready for such a momentous step. Nevertheless, within the last ten years it is commonly recognized that both mission and board must assume a decreasing rôle, while the churches abroad enter into a fuller enjoyment of their rights and liberties. At present the prevailing opinion seems to be that the time has not yet come for the complete separation of the forces. Both missionary and native ministry, mission board and national church, must work together as fellows and as equals; and this is being attempted, as a rule, through some joint committee representing both, to which are intrusted both jurisdiction and missionary moneys. But how can the churches at home be persuaded to continue the financial support of an enterprise which they no longer fully control? How may the churches on the mission field be brought speedily to a state of maturity commensurate with the new responsibilities assumed? Is there any danger that the universality and unity of the Kingdom of Heaven may be rent asunder by extreme nationalism as the cause of Christ has suffered in the past by sectarianism? These are some of the questions which are occupying the minds of men today.[5]

5. The prevailing opinion concerning other religions had been that non-Christian peoples were pagans, and the reli-

[5] *The Church in the Mission Field* (1910), *Edinburgh Reports,* Vol. II; A. J. Brown, *The Rising Churches in Non-Christian Lands* (1915); D. J. Fleming, *Devolution in Mission Administration* (1916); James L. Barton, *Devolution in the American Board in Japan*, Foreign Missions Conference, 1922; U. Kawaguchi, *The Missionary's Task from the Standpoint of the Japanese Church* (1923); K. T. Paul, "How Missions Denationalize Indians," *I.R.M.* (1919); Frank Lenwood, "The Effects of Modern Developments upon Mission Policy," *I.R.M.* (October, 1923); C. Y. Cheng, "The Development of an Indigenous Church in China," *I.R.M.* (July, 1923); D. J. Fleming, *Whither Bound in Missions?* (1924).

gions which they professed were false inventions which were to be supplanted by the full and true revelation of God to be found only in the Christian gospel, as practiced by the churches of the West. But certain forces have been operating which were bound to command attention even from the most ardent propagandist. Contrary to expectations, some of these religions which had been supposed to be dead began to take on new life and vitality. The work of anthropologists and of students of comparative religion brought to light sacred literature and hitherto unknown excellences which tended to neutralize the more shocking abominations which had horrified the earlier missionaries. A new attitude of fairness and a willingness to recognize virtue as well as to condemn vice began to prevail. A school of missionaries arose which sought to investigate and to understand the inner nature and history of these ethnic faiths and to discover the religious value which they had for their devotees. The religious rites, mysticism, and conversion experience of all lands, Christian and non-Christian, were subjected to the same types of studies and were found to be much more akin than was supposed. As yet, even the most liberal of the missionary forces have not been able to escape entirely from the apologetic interest. While the method has been increasingly scientific, the purpose has continued to be apologetic, namely, how to relate Christianity to other religions so as to conserve what may be considered to be its divine uniqueness while at the same time taking account of the excellences of rival faiths. To this end recourse has been had to the doctrine of progressive and preparatory revelation. The history of India or of Japan, as well as that of Israel, has been one long preparation for the coming of the full revelation of God in Christ Jesus. Christianity is the

"crown of Hinduism"; Jesus Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. He is the one in whom all that which has been incomplete and mingled with error now finds its glorious completion.[6]

In keeping with this interpretation there has been a tendency to bridge the gap which has separated Christian and heathen and to magnify the points which they hold in common rather than the contrasts. Investigation has been centered upon Oriental cultures and religions to discover precisely what forms of fusion are taking place through the present cultural interplay, how the passage from one religion to another might be made the easier, and what features of the old might be incorporated into the new without doing too great violence to the inner nature of Christianity or to the genius of the people.[7]

[6] Non-Christian religions are studied as centers of religious vitality by such writers as S. Cave, *Living Religions of the East* (1922); K. J. Saunders, "Buddhism as a Living Religion," *Journal of Religion* (July, 1922); F. W. S. O'Neill, *The Quest for God in China* (1925).

The works of William James, James B. Pratt, Leuba, and other psychologists of religion are familiar today to the missionary and are influencing his interpretation of religious phenomena. Scientific studies are being made in religious experience on the mission field; K. Kato, *The Psychology of Oriental Religious Experience* (1915); E. A. Annett, *Conversion in India;* A. C. Underwood, *Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian* (1925); M. T. Price, *Christian Missions and Oriental Civilizations* (1924).

Not only are missionaries increasingly familiar with, and influenced by, the studies of comparative religion, but they have been making their own contribution to this general field. Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India* (1915); *A Primer of Hinduism* (1912); *Outline of the Religious Literature of India* (1920); N. Macnicol, *Indian Theism* (1915); K. J. Saunders, *The Story of Buddhism* (1916); *Gotama Buddha* (1920); *Epochs in Buddhist History* (1924); John McKenzie (formerly a missionary), *Hindu Ethics* (1923); Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, *The Rites of the Twice-Born, The Heart of Jainism* (1915); S. M. Zwemer, *The Influence of Animism on Islam;* W. E. Scothill, *The Three Religions of China* (1913).

[7] John Warneck, *The Living Forces of the Gospel, The Experiences of a Missionary in Animistic Heathendom;* M. Junod, "God's Ways in a Bantu Soul,"

At the same time missionary theologians have been called upon to meet an attack from another angle. Non-Christian writers have not been backward in pointing the finger to many a defect in Christianity. They claim to be able to detect much of Western culture in the religion which the Christian has called divine. Christian people themselves are becoming more sensitive than ever before to the shortcomings of organized Christianity and to its failure to restrain the baser passions of the so-called "Christian nations." Scientific and historical investigation tends to interpret Christianity and all other religions as but one phase of human culture, and would account for each by attributing it to the naturalistic process. In the face of this insidious leveling process the proponents of Christianity have been seeking a new apologetic. Is there something divinely unique in Christianity? Something which puts it in a different class from all other religions and makes it worth propagating? If so, where can it be found? Seeing that the whole of the Christian system cannot be successfully defended, an effort has been made to separate divine content from human form, divine essence from cultural accretions. The latter are thrown to the wolves. The former is preserved as divine, and is to be proclaimed as the one gospel for the

---

I.R.M. (1914), p. 96; E. W. Smith, "The Sublimation of Bantu Life and Thought," *I.R.M.* (January, 1922); Campbell N. Moody, *The Mind of the Early Converts* (1920); G. E. Phillips, *The Ancient Church and Modern India* (1920); A. C. Kruyt, "The Appropriation of Christianity by Primitive Heathen in Central Celebes," *I.R.M.* (April, 1924); D. J. Fleming, *Contacts with Non-Christian Cultures* (1923); A. S. Woodbine, "The Present Religious Situation in India," *Journal of Religion* (July, 1923); "Mankind and the Church" (an attempt by missionary bishops of the Church of England to estimate the contribution of the great races to the fulness of the church of God); J. T. Addison, "Ancestral Worship and Protestant Christianity," *Journal of Religion* (March, 1925); W. H. Erskine, *Japanese Customs* (1925); W. D. Schermerhorn, "Syncretism in the Early Christian Period and in India," *Journal of Religion* (September, 1924).

whole earth. This is the position taken before the world; but amongst themselves Christians have not yet been able to attain to an agreement as to what precisely constitutes this irreducible divine essence. The extremists will claim such absolute finality even for denominational tenets and for full creedal statements. Some find it in the Apostles' Creed; others, in some highest common factor to be found in the diversified Christianity of today. An increasing number, however, are taking the position that the essence of Christianity and the heart of the divine revelation are to be found in Christ himself. It is Christ, then, that we are to give to the world, not Western culture or Western Christianity.[8]

6. The nineteenth century was marked by the geographical expansion of Christianity into all parts of the earth; the twentieth century is witnessing a deliberate attempt to extend the teachings and principles of Christ throughout the full gamut of human interest and activity. The early missionaries had not lacked interest in human welfare. Social service work took the form of kindly ministrations and efforts at alleviation. The prevailing motives were the humanitarian desire to relieve suffering and the ardent wish to make Christianity attractive to the lost.

These ministrations of mercy have continued to the present day. But in the meantime missionary attention has been

[8] For various efforts to discover and maintain the essence of Christianity, cf. W. Paton, *Jesus Christ and the World's Religions; Edinburgh Reports,* Vol. IV, *Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions* (1910); James H. Moulton, *Religions and Religion* (1913); M. Schlunk, *Die Weltreligionen und das Christentum* (1923) (the essence of Christianity consists in its doctrine of God the Father, Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit, the indweller); E. Stanley Jones, *The Christ of the Indian Road* (1925); Charles W. Gilkey, *Jesus and Our Generation* (Barrows Lectures, 1925); J. N. Farquhar, *The Crown of Hinduism* (1913); "Jesus Christ in the Thinking of the Orient," *Foreign Missions Conference,* 1924, pp. 137–49.

compelled, by the course of world-affairs, to shift from the misfortunes of the individual to certain great questions of corporate relationship and responsibility, such as war, universal peace, international justice, immigration policies, race prejudice, economic exploitation, and cultural imperialism. Formerly the evils which the missionary sought to remedy by his social service were mostly those inherent in the foreign culture and native to foreign countries, and the alleviation of such evils was thought to constitute a most convincing apologetic on behalf of Christian missions. The great corporate abuses concerning which the world is becoming increasingly sensitive today, however, are largely the outcome of the clash of the Western nations among themselves and of the long-continued exploitation of the weaker and more backward peoples by the stronger nations which bear the name of Christian. The sins of the Christian nations are now laid at the door of the Christian church, much to the embarrassment of the missionary. Some have sought to evade responsibility by withdrawing into a narrow pietism, accentuating the other-worldly aspects of religion. But the prevailing tendency has been to acknowledge frankly the shortcomings of Christendom, to confess the failure of Christianity to Christianize fully its own civilization, and to set out resolutely on the task of permeating all nations, Christian and non-Christian, and all the activities of life, corporate as well as individual, with the principles of justice and equality. Thus the sharp distinctions between Christendom and heathendom, sacred and secular, home missions and foreign missions, are gradually giving way to a conception of human solidarity and of the unity of human life.[9]

[9] The conception of mission work has been broadened so as to include the social as well as the individual gospel; James S. Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress*, 3 vols. (1895–1906); W. H. P. Faunce, *The Social Aspects of Foreign Mis-*

II

No one can study even superficially such questions as the above, which have occupied the minds of the missionary forces during the last twenty-five years, without discovering a gradual change in attitude and in method of approach.

The attitude to the missionary enterprise itself is passing through a perceptible transformation. Of course, it is thought of still as a crusade to be pushed with all vigor, but more and more it is coming to be looked upon as an object to be studied and a problem to be solved; and the attitude of the student to a problem is quite different from that of the soldier to his crusade. The nature of missionary preparation is changing, with a new emphasis upon the study of the sciences concerning man, the theory of missions, and the life-conditions of for-

---

sions (1914); E. W. Capen, *Sociological Progress in Mission Lands* (1914); Alva W. Taylor, *The Social Work of Christian Missions* (1914); Frank Lenwood, *Social Problems of the East* (1919); William Paton, *Social Ideals in India* (1919).

The literature dealing with the application of Christian principles to world-problems has been so extensive that only a few references can be given: Robert Speer, *Race and Race Relations* (1924); J. H. Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem* (1924); Basil Mathews, *The Clash of Color* (1924); W. C. Willoughby, *Race Problems in New Africa* (1923); S. L. Gulick, *The American Japanese Question: A Study of Racial Relations* (1914); A. J. S. MacDonald, *Trade, Politics, and Christianity in Africa and the Far East* (1916); J. N. Ogilvie, *Our Empire's Debt to Missions* (1924); C. H. Patton, *World Facts and America's Responsibility* (1919); Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, *The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War* (1920); A. J. MacDonald, *The War and Missions in the East* (1919); C. H. Fahs, *America's Stake in the Far East* (1920); K. S. Latourette, *History of the Early Relations between the United States and China* (1917); S. L. Gulick, *The Winning of the Far East* (1923); C. F. Andrews, *Christ and Labor* (1923); *Missions and Governments, Edinburgh Reports,* Vol. VII (1910); James L. Barton, "Some Missionary Activities in Relation to Governments," *I.R.M.* (July, 1924); Newton W. Rowell, K.C., "The League of Nations and the Assembly at Geneva," *I.R.M.* (1921), p. 402; Sherwood Eddy, *Everybody's World* (1920); Tyler Dennett, *A Better World* (1920); D. J. Fleming, *Marks of a World-Christian* (1919); K. Maclennan, *The Cost of a New World* (1925).

eign peoples; all of which is designed to equip the missionary with a new attitude to his task and an approved method for investigating it, as well as with up-to-date methods of practical efficiency.[10] Chairs of missions have been founded in the larger seminaries, colleges, and universities.[11] Students of missions the world over are no longer content to describe, however accurately, what takes place, but are making the missionary process itself an object of study in order to explain how and why such things do take place. The history of missions has been a favorite object of study since the close of the century.[12] More space has been given in missionary magazines to the exchange of serious scientific thought, and less to purely anecdotal and promotional material. New magazines, such as the *International Review of Missions,* the *Chinese Recorder,* and the *Moslem World,* have been established for this express purpose. Since 1890 a large number of books have appeared on the theory and principles of missions, in which the results of one hundred years of mission experience were arranged and interpreted according to a priori principles fur-

[10] *The Preparation of Missionaries, Edinburgh Reports,* Vol. V (1910); Julius Richter, *Weltmission und theologische Arbeit* (1913); G. A. Gollock, "Present Outlook on the Preparation of Missionaries," *I.R.M.* (July, 1924); J. Lovell Murray, "Missionary Preparation in North America; Its Development and Present Outlook," *I.R.M.* (October, 1925); for many years the Foreign Missions Conference of America has maintained a special committee on missionary preparation under the chairmanship of Dr. Frank K. Sanders.

[11] Halle, Berlin, Yale, Union, Boston, Chicago, Northwestern, etc.

[12] C. H. Robinson, *History of Christian Missions* (1915); E. C. Moore, *The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (1919); Otis Carey, *A History of Christianity in Japan* (1909); J. Richter, *A History of Missions in India* (1909); J. Richter, *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East* (1910); J. Du Plessis, *A History of Christian Missions in South Africa* (1911). *The History of Protestant Missions,* by G. Warneck, has passed through several revisions.

nished by the theology of the writer.[13] But within the last fifteen years more attention has been given to the detailed investigation of special problems and the careful diagnosis of concrete missionary situations. It is felt by many that any further efforts at generalization would be premature until we have familiarized ourselves much more thoroughly with conditions as they prevail, and have accumulated a much larger fund of verified facts.[14] Outside of mission circles the missionary enterprise has become an object of serious study on the part of sociologists and anthropologists. It is looked upon as one particular phase of a complex and inevitable interplay of peoples and exchange of cultures in which operate certain forces and laws which the scientist feels he is coming to understand better with every passing decade.[15]

There has been a noticeable change in the methods employed for the discovery of truth and the determination of

[13] W. N. Clarke, *A Study of Christian Missions* (1900); Robert A. Hume, *Missions from the Modern View* (1905); A. J. Brown, *The Foreign Missionary* (1907); Edwin M. Bliss, *The Missionary Enterprise* (1908); John P. Jones, *The Modern Missionary Challenge* (1910); Louise Creighton, *Missions: Their Rise and Development* (1912); Roland Allen, *Missionary Principles* (1913); G. A. Gollock, *An Introduction to Missionary Service* (1921); C. Patton, *The Business of Missions* (1924); Julius Richter, *Evangelische Missionskunde* (1920).

[14] Research societies and groups are being formed under missionary auspices. Much excellent material is appearing in the form of academic theses presented to seminaries and universities for higher degrees, by missionaries on furlough. Investigations into the religious experience of the foreign field have already been referred to. An increasing number of anthropological studies are appearing from the pens of missionaries: Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe* (1913); George W. Briggs, *The Chamars* (1920); H. I. Marshall, *The Karen People of Burma: A Study in Anthropology and Ethnology* (1922); Edwin W. Smith, *The Religion of Lower Races as Illustrated by the African Bantu* (1923); Paul Harrison, *The Arab at Home* (1924); William C. Smith, *The Ao Naga Tribe of Assam* (1925). Anthropological studies are recommended to missionaries: E. W. Smith, "Social Anthropology and Mission Work," *I.R.M.* (October, 1924); Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, "On the Study of Anthropology on the Mission Field," *I.R.M.* (1920), pp. 426–38, 581–91.

[15] M. T. Price, *Christian Missions and Oriental Civilizations* (1924).

policy. The missionary, of course, has continually considered himself to be the bearer of an authoritative word, to which he himself turned for truth and counsel; but more than any other Christian worker, perhaps, he has always been amenable to the facts of experience. The pioneer nature of his work made him such. Heretofore he has lacked a satisfactory method of funding and of interpreting the results of that experience. But in response to the spirit of the modern age he has been appreciating afresh the inexorable logic of facts and has been learning to apply the scientific method and technique to the tasks in hand. The great missionary conventions of the last twenty years have given only a limited place to platform oratory. The major parts of the sessions have been devoted to the consideration of reports on definite aspects of missionary work prepared by carefully chosen commissions, which have spent not simply months, but even years, in the accumulation of data. Either as critical occasions arose or at the conclusion of chronological periods, extensive surveys and investigations have been prepared by experts and have been laid before those charged with authority and administration, in order that theory and policy might be determined in the light of full and complete missionary experience. The current vocabulary of the laboratory and the classroom is finding its way into missionary literature, and even where the old biblical figures and phraseology still survive, they carry with them a new content, drawn from biology, psychology, sociology, and kindred sciences.[16]

[16] As evidences of the application of the empirical method to the field of missions might be mentioned: The series of missionary atlases, *Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions* (1901), *The World Atlas of Christian Missions* (1911), and the recent volume, *World Missionary Atlas* (1925); James S. Dennis, *Centennial Survey of Foreign Missions* (1902); the massive volume, *The Christian Occupation of China*

III

The new experience gained through facing the problems of the hour and the new methods of approaching and interpreting these have resulted in a changing conception concerning the nature and purpose of mission work and the manner of divine intervention on man's behalf. The missionary enterprise had been held to be the supreme and direct manifestation of the intervention of God on behalf of lost mankind. The rallying cry had become: "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation." Time was urgent. Souls were dying. The preaching of the gospel by the church was the indispensable means. God was the one efficient cause.[17] A few discerning men raised their voices in warning that the completeness of the missionary objective was being restricted and the subtlety of the Christianization process was being overlooked in an effort to cover the whole world in thirty-three years. Since then the slogan has been reinterpreted repeatedly to give it larger content and meaning. Nevertheless the fact remains that twenty-five years ago a narrow and intense conception of the missionary enterprise was for the time being in the ascendancy.

Meanwhile a different interpretation of religion began to prevail, which thought of God as working through history and

---

(1922); the work of the various educational commissions in China, India, and Africa; *Pekin: A Social Survey* (1921); Robert E. Speer, *Report on India and Persia* (1922); the surveys of the Interchurch World Movement and of the various denominational campaigns.

[17] John R. Mott, *The Evangelization of the World in this Generation* (1901). Various speakers so expressed themselves in the Ecumenical Conference at New York, 1900 (*Reports*, Vol. I, chap. iv). This has been the slogan at Student Volunteer conferences, banquets of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, and many other great gatherings.

nature, of Christianity as intimately bound up with culture, and of human society as well as the individual as the object of redemption. In conformity with this the cause of Christian missions has come to be interpreted not simply as a direct outreaching of Almighty God through the activity of his chosen people, but also as an integral part of the general political, commercial, and cultural expansion of the West.[18] A new interest and attention has been centered upon cultural antecedents and environment with the idea of discovering therein, rather than in the mysterious will of God, the subtle factors which determine the outcome of missionary activity. The non-Christian world is no longer treated as spiritually impotent—as soil, good or bad, into which the vital seed is dropped—but rather as an active and participating factor in a reciprocal interplay. Christ came not to destroy or to supplant, but rather to fulfil and even to stimulate to a new life.[19] Consequently the missionary is not simply to proselytize and win converts, but also, and more especially, to leaven the total life of the community with the spirit and principles of Jesus Christ.[20] The missionary objective is a reformed society as

[18] E. C. Moore, *The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (1919); E. C. Moore, *West and East: The Expansion of Christendom and the Naturalization of Christianity in the Orient in the Nineteenth Century* (1920); H. Frick, *Die evangelische Mission* (1922); K. S. Latourette, "The Study of the History of Missions," *I.R.M.* (January, 1925).

[19] The Barrows Lectures, although not strictly missionary, have uniformly taken this attitude. So likewise, Sherwood Eddy, *The Students of Asia;* G. C. Binyon, "Christianity and Hindu Character," *Constructive Quarterly* (1917), p. 359; D. J. Fleming, *Building with India;* S. G. Inman, "The Religious Approach to the Latin American," *Journal of Religion* (September, 1922); J. E. Merrill, "The Christian Approach to Islam," *I.R.M.* (October, 1922). In much of the recent literature mission work is spoken of under the figure of "fusion" or "crossing," rather than of "seed-sowing."

[20] B. Lucas, *Our Task in India: Shall We Proselytize Hindus or Evangelize India?* (1914).

well as a redeemed individual. The Kingdom of God is first to be established here below in the form of perfected human relationships; thus and only thus can a future Kingdom of the Heavens be realized. The missionary enterprise consists of something more than the faithful transmission of an inalterable, sacred deposit. It is itself a creative process, determining in part not simply what the world shall be, but also what the Christianity of the future shall be. Missionary thought is still in a formative process—a transition stage from the nineteenth century to the twentieth. There is no unanimity of opinion, but at least, within a growing number, the general tendency has been to emphasize the immanent and the natural, while not entirely denying the old-time supernaturalism in connection with the work.

On the other hand, there is the opposite tendency to emphasize the transcendental and the unique, while not entirely overlooking the natural. It is felt that the ultimate result of such concessions to liberal thought is the loss of all that is distinctively divine in Christianity, until it becomes simply one additional ethnic religion, unworthy of missionary activity and sacrifice.[21] In its extreme form the protest has become so unyielding and insistent that it threatens to split the missionary ranks in America, China, and other lands. Such a split is held to be preferable to any compromise concerning the authority of the Bible, the element of the miraculous, and the other-worldly character of the Kingdom. The great rank and file, however, of the more conservative wing are able to take

[21] H. C. Mabie, "The Divine Right of Christian Missions to Supplant," *American Journal of Theology* (1907), p. 1; A. E. Garvie, "The Christian Challenge to Other Faiths," *I.R.M.* (1912), p. 659; D. MacKichan, "I Came Not to Destroy, But to Fulfil," *I.R.M.* (1914), p. 243; S. M. Zwemer, "Christianity, the Final Religion," *Constructive Quarterly* (1919), p. 171.

a more tolerant attitude to the findings of science and to the virtues of other religions through the use of some mediating principle by means of which they feel themselves able to harmonize the truth of revelation with the disturbing facts of present-day discovery and experience.[22]

Inherent in this general position is the temptation to despair of the world as an object of redemption and to profess a narrower objective as the purpose of Christian missions. It is held by some that the chief object is not the improvement of world-conditions, but the speedy gathering out of the church or the body of Christ and the hastening of the coming of the Lord. Others, influenced more by a pessimistic philosophy with reference to the world than by biblical literalism, interpret the purpose and nature of Christian missions in an equally pessimistic fashion, so far as this world is concerned. One group of missionary writers, under the sway of Indian thought, maintain that the religion of Jesus is not, in essence, world-reform, nor even forgiveness of sins. It is pre-eminently redemption *from* this world, bringing to the saved soul a glorious sense of victory over all that which contaminates, limits, and restricts, in and through union with Jesus Christ and the Absolute. The world is doomed. Salvation is escape from the world through a miraculous enlightenment and reinforcement which comes from God.[23] In this category also belong the views of the philosopher-missionary Albert Schweitzer, who speaks out of the pessimism of a post-war world. Schweitzer despairs of the efforts both of the scientist to ex-

[22] It is held that either in the Bible or else in Jesus Christ God has stored up all mystery and all knowledge, which in due season is now being brought to light and understood through the discoveries of science. The doctrine of progressive revelation also serves the same purpose.

[23] Sidney Cave, *Redemption, Hindu and Christian* (1919); A. G. Hogg, *Redemption from this World,* or *The Supernatural in Christianity* (1922).

plain the world and of the humanitarian to reform it. Man must choose between an ethical religion and a religion that appears rational and explains the world. The two can never be harmonized. Schweitzer's hope is placed in a transcendental God who is ethical will, who is known through religious intuition, and who alone is the source of redemptive power. Life finds its meaning only in so far as man is brought into harmony with the ethical will of God. This consummation is brought about through the Christian religion and especially through the missionary enterprise, but it is essentially an act of God and not of man. "In reality Jesus does not speak of the Kingdom of God as of something that comes into existence in this world through the development of human society, but something which is brought about by God. . . . . In the thought of Jesus, the ethical activity of man is only like a powerful prayer to God that he may cause the Kingdom to appear without delay."[24] Thus, in one form or another, men despair of human power and of world-redemption and take refuge in a more restricted missionary objective and in the saving grace of God.

In a word, then, back behind all the more immediate practical questions which have made a constant demand upon the mental resourcefulness of the missionary forces men have been trying to work out a new philosophy of missions, a philosophy which will take account of three constituent and fundamental factors, whereas formerly one alone was considered to be basal and formative. During the nineteenth century mission theory was dominated by the conception of divine authority, revelation, and power. Therefore the missionary spoke with the authority of the prophet and admin-

[24] Albert Schweitzer, *Christianity and the Religions of the World* (1923); Schweitzer, *The Decay and Restoration of Civilization* (1923).

istered in the name of God. But the new century witnessed the introduction of two comparatively new factors which disturb these a priori positions of the past. The democratic self-assertion of the native church and of the whole non-Christian world challenges the authority of the administrator; the new scientific spirit and method of the liberal challenge the authority of the prophet and call for a new interpretation of the divine. Formerly the so-called "native" was immature; now he has arrived and claims a voice in the councils. Formerly the so-called "liberal" was chided because of his lack of interest in the redemption of the world. Today the liberal is found in most missionary circles. He feels that he is beginning to understand some things which have been mysterious. He believes that through this new understanding and method he has a very valuable contribution to make. He feels that he can participate heartily in such an enterprise as the cause of missions is coming to be. How then, and to what extent, can traditional supernaturalism, democratic self-realization, and scientific pragmatism be combined and harmonized into one progressive humanitarian movement? This is the problem of the twentieth century.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY IN AMERICA

SHAILER MATHEWS

Organized Christianity has always been interested in the social life of its members. From the days of its founding, the church has been a laboratory of progressive morality. Leaders like Ambrose and Chrysostom have left us clear-cut ideas on economic matters, and the church of the Middle Ages legislated regarding interest, marriage, feuds, and charity. From the rise of the Reformation, however, new currents were set in motion. The Lutheran movement sprang from a society that was little touched by commerce, and the economic teaching of Luther was largely that of the agrarian who feared, as well as misunderstood, city life. In his sermons and various tracts he dealt with many of the factors of our social life which the Catholic church had treated in its canon law, but he was tempted, like most agrarian reformers, to attribute too many of the social evils to the church he criticized and opposed. Calvinism, on the other hand, sprang from municipalities and tended to become the religious spirit of the self-conscious *bourgeoisie* fighting for its life against not only ecclesiastical but imperial control. The English church carried forward the traditions both of the nation and of the church, and assumed a direct control of land and many social practices. The nationalistic tendency which found expression in the Protestant movement over all Europe tended to benefit church and state, and more than one country developed a sort of so-

cial philosophy in which the two were not only intimately related, but were opposite sides of the same great social entity. The rise of non-conformity, however, tended to separate the church from the state, and in the colonies of America this separation became universal and, for the first time in any political entity, constitutional.

The eighteenth century saw not only the rise of democracy among English-speaking peoples and, with modifications, in France, but it also saw the marked individualization of religion. The church accepted the economic and social *status quo,* and devoted itself to the saving of individual souls. Where, as in the case of slavery, an attempt was made by Christians to effect social change, there followed a cleavage among the non-conformist churches like the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. Each of the two main divisions thus formed tended to maintain the social *status quo;* churches in the North, where there were no slaves, favored antislavery, and churches in the South, where slavery existed, championed it. And slavery was as much an economic as a political issue.

After the Civil War, the period of revivalism which had begun with Finney developed under the leadership of Dwight L. Moody and laid emphasis almost exclusively upon individual salvation. The doctrines stressed were chiefly those of the substitutionary atonement and the necessity of rebirth. The ethical connotation which the Christian life bore was hardly more than conventional morality. Little attempt was made in the name of religion to change the economic or social *status quo,* although decided emphasis was given to missionary activities in non-Christian lands. The indifference which organized Christianity showed to the labor movement and capital-

istic control was the reflection of the general state of mind. The study of political economy was largely dominated by Mill, and labor was treated more as a commodity than as a human activity. Christians were, of course, expected to obey the Ten Commandments, but the rapid development of the capital-wage system was not regarded as an object of concern on the part of the churches. While the Christian Socialists of England had affected the popular mind, especially through the work of Maurice and the novels of Charles Kingsley, a study of the sermons and of the resolutions passed by religious bodies during the middle of the nineteenth century will show widespread indifference to social problems of the more fundamental sort. Religion was as sharply distinguished from the economic and social activities of its followers as was the church from the state.

In the eighties, however, there began to arise an interest in the study of sociology. For a considerable period, within the church, this was limited to a small circle of clergymen, while individualism continued to dominate church ideals.

Although this new interest was felt throughout Christendom, reference can be made here chiefly to its expression in the United States.

Washington Gladden and Josiah Strong were the forerunners of a new religious interest. The former, in a succession of volumes (e.g., *Workingmen and Their Employers,* 1876; *Applied Christianity,* 1887; *Tools and the Man,* 1893), sounded a note which found immediate response from younger men in the ministry who came under the influence of the new social studies rapidly developing in the decade between 1880 and 1890. Josiah Strong's *Our Country* (1886) was, in a way, epoch-making. His approach would seem somewhat unscien-

tific to our present-day thinkers, thanks to the widespread teaching of the social sciences, but the volume was widely read and was singularly provocative of social sympathy. In it, more distinctly and statistically than was the method of Washington Gladden, he discussed the evils and the possibilities of contemporary society. His later works (notably *The New Era,* 1893, and *The Next Great Awakening,* 1902) were widely read, and served to deepen the interest, and, what is possibly even more significant, helped to popularize the conception of the Kingdom of God as a social ideal. He was not altogether a pioneer in this, for the remarkable work of Freemantle, *The World as the Subject of Redemption,* had given to religion a new horizon, and to religious activity new goals. Professor Richard T. Ely, then a rising economist, had in 1889 published his *Social Aspects of Christianity,* which probably was the first attempt in America to bring technical economic science to bear on the understanding of the Christian faith. Also, David Jayne Hill, in a series of lectures delivered at Newton Theological Institution and published under the title of *The Social Influence of Christianity* (1888), had opened many important problems. In this same connection should be mentioned E. Benjamin Andrews, who, as professor of political economy and later president of Brown University, stimulated interest in the moral aspects of economic life, although, with the exception of lectures given in Hartford Theological Seminary and published as *Wealth and the Moral Law* (1894), his volumes were not specifically directed to this end. A novel by Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward,* popularized socialism, but did not undertake specifically to discuss the social aspects of religion.

A new note was sounded by George D. Herron, professor

in Grinnell College. Possessed of an exceptional power of exposition and passionate enthusiasm for the sufferers from economic injustice, Professor Herron, through his *The Larger Christ* (1891) and *The Christian Society* (1894), was a social prophet among the younger clergy. Without qualification Christianity was publicly heralded as a message of discontent with economic evils, and the teachings of Jesus made a call to economic reconstruction. This new appreciation of the social significance of Christianity led to the organization of several bodies, the best known of which were probably the Brotherhood of the Kingdom (1892) and the Christian Social Union, a Christian Socialist organization in which W. D. P. Bliss was especially influential.

The last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the present century, however, saw a general expansion in what has since become the social gospel. During 1895 and 1896 the *Journal of Sociology* published a series of articles on "Christian Sociology" by Mathews, which were subsequently republished under the title of *The Social Teaching of Jesus* (1897). This pioneer work in the systematic presentation of the teaching of Jesus in its application to the new range of social affairs was followed in 1900 by Francis G. Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question,* which remains to this day one of the most comprehensive and sanest treatments of its field. The *American Journal of Sociology,* under the editorship of Professor Albion W. Small, published a number of articles in the same field, and the *Bibliotheca Sacra* became temporarily "a religious and sociological quarterly" in the furthering of the new interest. In 1892 Professor Charles R. Henderson, who, as pastor of the Woodward Avenue Baptist Church in Detroit, had become interested in labor disputes and had served as arbitrator in a serious strike, was called as

professor of Ecclesiastical Sociology in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He became one of the centers of interest in the more practically scientific study of social matters, and in his classroom and in a large number of public relations he brought the religious interest to bear upon industrial life. In the same year Graham Taylor was appointed professor of Christian Sociology in the Chicago Theological Seminary. In 1894 he established Chicago Commons, and entered upon a most influential career as a sane but loyal friend of labor. His influence was felt in wide circles, and, like Dr. Henderson, he served as a stimulus to a number of young men who became either Christian ministers or leaders in social service. About this time Harry F. Ward became pastor of a church in the Stockyards district, and later entered upon his career as a champion of social Christianity, first in the Boston University School of Theology and then in Union Theological Seminary. At the beginning of the present century a number of seminaries introduced courses known as Christian Sociology or Social Service, and from that time no seminary of any progressive leaning whatever has been neglectful of this discipline.

The literature of the subject now grew rapidly. In 1902 appeared O. Cone's volume on *The Rich and Poor in the New Testament,* and Washington Gladden's *Social Salvation.* In 1903 Heuver published a Doctor's thesis, *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning Wealth.* In 1907 appeared *The Church and the Changing Order,* by Mathews, and Walter Rauschenbusch's volume, *Christianity and the Social Crisis.* The two books were in a way supplementary to each other, but the latter was more incisive in its criticism of the present economic order. Professor Rauschenbusch was an academic socialist

and filled with an extraordinary sympathy with every person and institution suffering from social or economic injustice. He possessed a style of singular brilliancy, and his criticism of the economic practices of capitalistic organizations was scathing. His later works, *Christianizing the Social Order* (1912) and *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1917), were restatements from somewhat different points of view of positions taken in his first book. In his *Prayers for the Social Awakening* he rendered a service to religion which can hardly be overestimated. Also in his classroom and in his many addresses, Professor Rauschenbusch became a potent influence among the clergy. In 1908 were published Earp's *Social Aspects of Religious Institutions* and J. R. Campbell's *Christianity and the Social Order,* and in 1910, Hall's *Social Solutions in the Light of Christian Ethics,* as well as Ward's *Social Ministry.*

Somewhat later, the Y.M.C.A., the Missionary Education Movement, and various religious publications issued small books for class study by Professors Jenks, of Cornell, Rauschenbusch, of Rochester, and Mathews, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. In 1912 appeared *Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus,* by Professor Vedder, of Crozer Theological Seminary, and *Sociological Study of the Bible,* by Wallis, and in 1913, *Religion in Social Action,* by Graham Taylor. In 1913 Professor Gerald Birney Smith, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, published the Taylor Lectures at Yale Divinity School, *Social Idealism and the Changing Theology,* a thoroughgoing exposition of a subject treated less technically by Professor Rauschenbusch. And these are only a few titles of volumes appearing 1900–1917.

So widespread had the interest in social Christianity become in the years immediately preceding the war that there

were few religious bodies that had not established social-service commissions. The first of those was probably that of the Protestant Episcopal church. The publication houses of these various bodies also began a publication of pamphlets and books, chief among which were those published by the American Baptist Publication Society and the Methodist Book Concern (Soares, *The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible*). The new interest may be seen in a succession of resolutions published by the central bodies of the various denominations. A study of these resolutions will show how general the recognition of the social significance of Christianity had become. Perhaps the most outspoken of these resolutions were those passed by the Canadian Methodists, but other significant utterances came from Roman Catholic bishops. But probably the most influential of all these resolutions was the "Social Creed of the Churches," drawn up originally by Frank Mason North and others in 1908, adopted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America in 1908, and revised in 1912 and in subsequent meetings. They stand today as the formulation of the position of Protestant churches toward various social questions.

For the few years after 1915, the books dealing with society from a Christian point of view were practically all reworkings of the positions taken in the books published between 1897 and 1907. There seems also to be a distinct reaction against identifying Christianity with socialism. But the extent of this literature indicates an interest permanently embodied in the Christian movement.

Since the war, if we except Dickey, *The Constructive Revolution of Jesus; The Church and the Industrial Reconstruction* (by the Committee on the War and the Religious Out-

look); Ellwood, *Christianity and Social Science;* Stead, *The Story of Social Christianity;* and Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism,* the more creative writers in this field have dealt less with general principles which had been so fully and effectively set forth in preceding years, and, as in sociology itself, have been more concerned with the discussion of concrete problems. The pulpit became deeply interested in reforms of all sorts. For a few years the Presbyterians did pioneer work with organized labor under the direction of Charles Stelzle and with rural conditions under Warren H. Wilson. The Social Commissions, both of denominations and of the Federal Council, busied themselves with distinct issues. A committee appointed by the Interchurch World Movement published an exhaustive study of the steel strike, which was to have an influence upon the entire industry. The Y.W. C.A. openly and without qualification put itself on record as favoring economic reforms and a more Christian treatment of labor. In co-operation with the Congregational Commission of Social Service, the Commission on Social Service of the Federal Council made a report upon various strikes. This Commission has of late developed a very important type of research, which publishes the results of its investigations, as well as those of other bodies, of various issues with which the church should be concerned. So effective had this body become as to arouse decided opposition in bodies like the Pittsburgh Manufacturers' Association and similar organizations of capital. The influence of the new spirit, however, has been steady, and a comparison of the economic world at present with that of twenty-five years ago will show a decided movement toward ideals set forth in the various resolutions of the churches and other religious bodies.

Since the war, also, there has been agitation on the part of the churches, and, more particularly, of certain groups of men of earnest Christian zeal, in favor of world peace. The number of organizations devoted to the spread of this is considerable. Some of them, like the Society of Friends, and the Fellowship for Reconciliation, are strongly pacifist in nature, and others, like the Church Peace Union, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, and "The Inquiry" are more inclined to regard the establishment of peace as dependent upon education and the establishment of various legislative and other means of practical action.

Closely allied with this tendency is the new attempt to apply Christianity to interracial tensions. A noteworthy book in this field is Oldham's *Christianity and the Race Problem.*

The cause of prohibition has not been represented so much in literature as in practical policy and church action. The passage of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was due to the influence of many organizations like the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League, the membership of which is largely drawn from evangelical churches.

The Universal Conference on Christian Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925 was noteworthy in that for the first time in history the representatives of all Christian bodies, with the exception of the Roman Catholic church, which declined the invitation, for ten days discussed fully and intelligently, albeit cautiously, the bearing of Christianity upon various social matters, including labor, war, and prohibition. These discussions were based upon reports brought in by commissions from various countries. In this conference the influence of the English movement, "Copec," was distinctly felt.

The extent to which these social conceptions have affected youth can be clearly seen during the last ten years in various meetings of students, both national and denominational. In these conferences discussions have largely replaced so-called "inspirational" addresses, and the chief topics under consideration are those which are the outcome of the last generation of discussion and education. Particularly acute at the present time is the interest in interracial and international affairs. Church groups are now, as never before, considering the Christian attitude toward the relations of nations and the relations of races and civilizations.

Any discussion, however, of this new interest in social affairs in the churches would be incomplete without mention of opposing movements in the same field. Popular Pre-millenarianism, which reached its peak during and just after the war, is distinctly opposed to the attempt to transform what is regarded as a lost world, and bids men wait for the coming of the Lord before any attempts at social reconstruction are made. This type of religious interest, which always reasserts itself in moments of social crisis in attempts to restate the eschatological position of primitive Christianity, is widespread and thoroughly aggressive. Somewhat similar to this, though very different in quality and in leadership, is the "crisis theology" of Germany, where the effort is made to develop a somewhat mystical reliance upon and conformity with the will of God as over against the Christian transformation of society and civilization.

If the dominant interest of the Christian movement is to be measured by its literature, it is clear that the Protestant churches of America, of Great Britain, and, to some extent, of France accept the social bearing of Christianity as beyond

dispute. The scanty literature of the pioneering stage has now swollen to a vast stream of books, pamphlets, and lesson helps. When one compares this situation with that of the decade following 1895, one is convinced that the old individualism of evangelicalism is being supplemented by the social evangelicalism. While the gospel remains a message to individuals, its more general implications in social life are now taken widely as a matter of course. The next few years bid fair to see the extension of the accepted principles of the teachings of Jesus to the entire range of concrete social issues. For, thanks to the universality of social studies, as well the historical interpretation of the New Testament and the Christian movement, men have come to see that any religion that is indifferent to the social relations in which individuals are involved is incapable of dealing effectively with the individuals themselves.

[PRINTED IN U.S.A.]